A SYMPOSIUM ON ESCHATOLOGY

P

F. C. Porter.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/symposiumonescha0000unse

A SYMPOSIUM

ON

ESCHATOLOGY

BY MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY
OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE AND EXEGESIS

Journal of Biblical Literature
Vol. XLI. 1922. Parts I and II.

LIBRARY OF
Bonebrake Theological Seminary
BS
680
E8
S63
S6 1923 22,941

NEW HAVEN
PUBLISHED FOR THE SOCIETY BY THE
YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS
MDCCCCXXIII

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah's Hopes for the Future.
K. Fullerton 1

II. The Origin of Jewish Eschatology.
N. Schmidt 102

III. Some Observations on the Attitude of the Synagogue toward the Apocalyptic Eschatological Writings.
L. Ginzberg 115

IV. The Place of Apocalyptical Conceptions in the Mind of Jesus.
E. F. Scott 137

V. The 'Son of Man' in the Usage of Jesus.
B. W. Bacon 143

VI. The Place of Apocalyptical Conceptions in the Thought of Paul.
F. C. Porter 183

PREFACE

The fortieth annual meeting of The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis held in New York in December, 1921, was marked by an introductory Symposium on the subject of Biblical Eschatology. These addresses, five in number, by scholars representative of biblical science both in Old and New Testament, are subjoined. To them is prefixed the Opening Address of the President of the Society, whose topic was closely allied. In reprinting these six addresses to form a separate volume the authors hope they may be rendering a service to biblical theology in one of its most important and keenly debated fields.

B. W. B.

VIEWPOINTS IN THE DISCUSSION OF ISAIAH'S HOPES FOR THE FUTURE[1]

KEMPER FULLERTON
OBERLIN GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

IN reading Schweitzer's *Quest of the Historical Jesus* some years ago, I was struck by the analogy between the problem of the significance of Jesus and the problem of the significance of Isaiah. The two schools of thought which have followed different paths in the quest of the historical Jesus have followed different paths in the quest of the historical Isaiah. According to one of these schools, the controlling interest both of Jesus and Isaiah is eschatological, supernaturalistic, even apocalyptic; according to the other, it is ethical and spiritual. It is an easy charge for the eschatologists to make that the rival interpretation is only an attempt to modernize Jesus and the prophets, to make their teachings intelligible to the modern man and serviceable to the needs of modern life. The ethical school might retort that the eschatologists, in the laudable desire not to subordinate historical research to the practical interests of the present, have

[1] The Introduction and Second Part of the present essay, now somewhat expanded, were given as the Presidential Address before the Society at its annual meeting in December, 1921. The essay seeks to present a resumé of the more important points of view in Isaiah-research, but a resumé which is at the same time an argument, and which suggests a conclusion. Naturally, however, even in the exceptionally roomy space which has been so generously allotted to me in the JOURNAL, the exegetical basis of the argument could not be introduced except in a few more important instances. I hope some day to make good this deficiency in another connection.

become so obsessed by the alien idiom in which the timeless truths of the spiritual world are expressed as to ignore these eternal truths themselves; the fascination of a foreign tongue, the curiosity which it excites, have proved too much for them. These mutual recriminations get us nowhere, except in so far as they warn us of the necessity constantly to correct our personal equations—the most necessary, as it is the most difficult, thing for a historical investigator to do. In the case of Isaiah, the neo-critical school,[2] which has dominated Isaiah research during the past generation, has in general inclined to the ethical and spiritual interpretation of the prophet, though with one notable exception. Duhm has always contended for a theory of the prophet's significance, which, while by no means ignoring the ethical and spiritual elements in his teachings, has greatly emphasized the eschatological and supernatural. Of course, the scholars of conservative convictions have always rejoiced in the eschatological interpretation, for it is supposed to do justice to the Messianic idea in prophecy which has played the leading role in ecclesiastical exegesis of the Old Testament. In recent years the conservative positions have been supported from a most unexpected quarter. The archaeological school[3] of criticism, represented especially by Gunkel and Gressmann, has done much, it is claimed, to strengthen the conservative defense of the genuineness of certain prophecies attributed to Isaiah, in which the eschatological element is especially prominent, and upon which the attack of the neo-critical school has been most

[2] By the neo-critical school is meant that group of scholars who accept in general the principles of the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis and who, starting with the rejection of the Babylonian and kindred prophecies in Isaiah (cc. 12; 13 1—14 23; 21 1-10; 24—27; 34; 35) have steadily advanced to more drastic eliminations. The neo-critical movement was initiated by Stade in a series of articles on Zechariah in the ZATW 1881—84; it received its greatest impetus from Duhm's great commentary on Isaiah in 1892.

[3] I select the name "archaeological school" because it is chosen by Gressmann, himself, to differentiate his method of investigation from that of the neo-critical school. (See *Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie*, pp. 2, 246.) The significance of this designation will appear in the sequel.

determined. But I would warn conservative friends to fear the Trojans bearing gifts. Sellin, however, who has been the quickest to perceive the new strategy provided by the archaeological school for the defense of the conservative position and who has made the shrewdest use of it, claims that the neo-critical school has not only failed to carry this new system of defense, but has failed even to make the attempt to do so. This accusation has a certain measure of truth in it. The debate between the two schools of interpretation, which was beginning to be so interesting just before the war, was prorogued indefinitely. Little, at least little that has been accessible to me, has been done to meet Sellin's challenge.[4]

[4] For Sellin's challenge see *Der A. T. Prophetismus*, p. 111. The following Bibliography does not claim to be exhaustive, but it aims to give a list of those works which have contributed directly to the following discussion.

Commentaries.

1724. Vitringa, Commentarius in librum prophetiarum Jesaiae.
1779—'81. Koppe, Jesaias.
1821. Gesenius, Der Prophet Jesaia.
1833. Hitzig, Der Prophet Jesaja.
1867. Ewald, Propheten des Alten Bundes. 2. Ausg.
1872. Knobel, Der Prophet Jesaia. 4. Ausg. (revised by Diestel).
1884. Cheyne, The Prophecies of Isaiah. 5. Ed., 1889.
1887. Bredenkamp, Der Prophet Jesaia.
1887. Orelli, Die Propheten Jesaja und Jeremia.
1889. Delitzsch, Commentar über das Buch Jesaia. 4. Aufl.
1890. Dillmann, Der Prophet Jesaia. 2. Aufl. (Kittel), 1898.
1892. Duhm, Das Buch Jesaia. 2. Aufl., 1902; 4. Aufl., 1914.
1895. Cheyne, Introduction to the Book of Isaiah.
1896. Skinner, Book of the Prophet Isaiah (Cambridge Bible). 2. Ed., 1915.
1897. Geo. Adam Smith, The Book of Isaiah (Expositors Bible).
1900. Marti, Das Buch Jesaja.
1905. Whitehouse, Isaiah (New Century Bible).
1911. Wade, Isaiah (Westminster Commentaries).
1912. Gray, Isaiah (International Critical Commentary).
1915. Hans Schmidt, Jesaia (Schriften des A. T. in Auswahl).

General Works, Monographs and Special Articles.

1875. Duhm, Theologie der Propheten.
1882. Robertson Smith, Prophets of Israel. 2. Ed., 1895.
1881—'84. Stade, Deuterozacharja and miscellaneous articles.

It is one of the aims of this address to examine the Gunkel-Gressmann theories and methods as applied to Isaiah. Have these men furnished a really adequate basis for the defense of

1881—'85. Stade, Geschichte des Volkes Israel. Vol. I; Vol. II, 1888.
1884. Cornill, Composition des Buches Jesaia. ZATW, pp. 83—105.
1884. Smend, Über die Bedeutung des Tempels. STK, p. 689 ff.
1885. Guthe, Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaias.
1885. Sörensen, Juda und die Assyrische Weltmacht (Chemnitzer Programm).
1886. Wellhausen, Prolegomena z. Geschichte Israels. 3. Ausg. Chapters I and XI, especially.
1888. Driver, Isaiah, his Life and Times (Men of the Bible).
1888. Giesebrecht, Die Immanuel-Weissagung. STK.
1890. Giesebrecht, Beiträge z. Jesajakritik.
1892. Kuenen, Historisch-kritische Einleitung etc. Deutsche Ausg.
1892. Winckler, Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen. pp. 26—49 (On the Isaiah Narratives).
1893. Hackmann, Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia.
1895. Gunkel, Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit.
1895. Porter, A Suggestion regarding Isaiah's Immanuel. JBL, pp. 19—36.
1897. Brückner, Die Composition des Buches Jesaia. cc. 28—33.
1897. Volz, Die Vorexilische Prophetie und der Messias.
1898. Meinhold, Die Jesaiaerzählungen.
1899. Smend, Lehrbuch der A. T. Religionsgeschichte. 2. Aufl.
1901. Sellin, Studien z. Entstehungsgeschichte d. Jüdischen Gemeinde.
1902. Boehmer, Der ATliche Unterbau des Reiches Gottes.
1902. Nagel, Der Zug des Sanherib gegen Jerusalem.
1902. Nowack, Die Zukunftshoffnungen Israels in der Assyrischen Zeit (Festschrift Holtzmann's, p. 33 ff.).
1902. Procksch, Geschichtsbetrachtung und Geschichtliche Überlieferung bei den Vorexilischen Propheten.
1903. Gunkel, Forschungen z. Religion und Literatur des Alten u. Neuen Testaments.
1903. Meinhold, Der heilige Rest. Studien z. Israelitischen Religionsgeschichte, Bd. I.
1903. Prášek, Sanherib's Feldzüge gegen Judah.
1904. Kautzsch, Religion of Israel. H. D. B. extra Vol.
1905. Stade, Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments.
1905. Wilke, Jesaja und Assur.
1906. Gressmann, Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie.
1906. Kennett, The Prophecy in Is. 9 1-7. Journal of Theological Studies (April).

those prophecies in the first thirty-nine chapters against which the neo-critical school has delivered its most formidable attacks?

In order to understand the strategy of the defense it is

1906. Küchler, Die Stellung des Propheten Jesaia z. Politik seiner Zeit.
1907. Guthe, Jesaia, Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher.
1908. Baentsch, Prophetie und Weissagung. ZWTh, p. 457 ff.
1908. Caspari, Echtheit, Hauptbegriff u. Gedankengang der Messianischen Weissagung. Is. 9 1-7.
1908. Oesterley, Evolution of the Messianic Idea.
1908. Staerk, Das Assyrische Weltreich im Urtheil der Propheten.
1908. Westphal, Jahweh's Wohnstätten.
1909. Herrmann, Der Messias aus Davids Geschlecht. ZWTh, p. 260 ff.
1909. Kittel, Geschichte des Volkes Israels. Bd. II, 2. Ausg.
1910. Kennett, Composition of the Book of Isaiah.
1910. Sellin, Einleitung in d. Alte Testament. 2. Aufl., 3. Aufl., 1920.
1912. Sellin, Der Alttestamentliche Prophetismus.
1914. Beer, Zur Zukunftserwartung Jesajas (Festschrift Wellhausen, pp. 15—35).
1914. Buttenwieser, The Prophets of Israel.
1914. Dittmann, Der heilige Rest im A. T. STK.
1914. Hölscher, Die Propheten.
1914. J. M. P. Smith, שאר ישוב, ZATW, pp. 219—224.
1914. Wellhausen, Israelitische u. Jüdische Geschichte. 7. Ausg., Nachdruck, 1919.
1915. König, Geschichte der Alttestamentlichen Religion.
1916. Duhm, Israels Propheten.
1917. Louise B. Smith, The Messianic Ideal of Isaiah. JBL, pp. 158—172.
1918. Mitchell, Isaiah on the Fate of his People and their Capital. JBL, p. 149 ff.
1919. Sachsse, Die Propheten des A. T. und ihre Gegner.
1920. Aytoun, The Rise and Fall of the Messianic Hope in the Sixth Century. JBL, pp. 24—43.
1920. Feigin, The Meaning of Ariel. JBL, pp. 131—137.
1920. Reisner, Discoveries in Ethiopia. Harvard Theological Review, pp. 23—44.

To the above list I append the following articles of my own which have immediately to do with the subject:

1905. A New Chapter in the Life of Isaiah. AJTh (Oct.).
1906. The Invasion of Sennacherib. Bibliotheca Sacra, Oct.
1907. Shebna and Eliakim. A Reply to Professor König. AJTh, July.
1913. The Book of Isaiah. Harvard Theological Review, Oct.
1916. Isaiah's earliest Prophecy against Ephraim. AJSL, April.

necessary to understand the strategy of the attack. Our study falls, therefore, into two main divisions, the presentation of the neo-critical thesis, and the presentation of the 'archaeological' antithesis. But within each of these two main divisions we discover two subdivisions. The neo-critical school directs its attack from a common base of operations, namely the general position of criticism represented by Wellhausen's *Prolegomena*. But it soon develops that there are two very different attacking columns, one led by Duhm and the other by Stade. The one champions the eschatological interpretation, the other the ethical and spiritual. The 'archaeological' school carries on its defense, if we may elaborate our military figure a little farther, by a flanking movement. It, too, occupies Wellhausen territory, but in the rear of the enemy, and it seeks to turn, very ingeniously, the tactics of the neo-critical forces against themselves. Sellin represents an independent unit within the defensive positions of the 'archaeologists'. The struggle thus appears to be a sort of four-cornered one and presents much the same impression of confusion as the melée in which Jonathan and the Philistines were involved at the pass of Michmash, and which 'melted away hither and thither' before the eyes of Saul.

Fortunately for our purposes there is a considerable acreage of what may be called neutral territory upon which the clashing forces have agreed to meet on equal terms. In the first place there is a fairly large amount of material which is admitted on all hands to be genuine. This material is found in the prophecies of doom. It is sufficient in amount to permit of reasonably secure conclusions as to Isaiah's general style, and as to some of the ideas in which he was most profoundly interested. The doom prophecies, therefore, furnish invaluable criteria for the

1916. Studies in Isaiah. JBL, pp. 134—142.
1918. The Problem of Is. Chap. X. AJSL, April.
1918. Immanuel. AJSL, July.
1920. The Stone of the Foundation. AJSL, Oct.
1921. The Problem of Isaiah. Journal of Religion, May.

In what follows the above mentioned books and articles are usually referred to simply by the name of the author, except where a more precise reference to the particular work is necessary in order to avoid confusion.

discussion of the disputed prophecies. Again, the outlines of the larger historical background of Isaiah's age are now, thanks to the monuments, fairly clear. Yet in two important particulars there is still, unfortunately, room for debate. The first of these concerns the year of Hezekiah's accession, the second and more pressing question is: What really happened in 701? The first point bears upon the question: When did the pro-Assyrian policy of Ahaz change to the anti-Assyrian policy of Hezekiah, and that in turn upon the question of the circumstances under which Isaiah delivered a number of his threats. The problem of what happened in 701 is the central problem of Isaiah. Were Isaiah's promises vindicated at that time, or his threats? This at once raises the question of the relationship of Isaiah's hopes to his threats.

As I have brought out elsewhere,[5] there are four great doctrines in the first thirty-nine chapters which have been supposed to express Isaiah's hopes for the future: the doctrines of the Day of the Lord, of the Remnant, of the Messianic King, and of the Inviolability of Zion. The first of these is allied more closely to the threats, the second hovers between the threats and the hopes, the last two are the great expressions of hope. The first two doctrines are unanimously admitted to be genuine elements in Isaiah's teaching. It must, therefore, be borne in mind in all that follows that the genuineness of one important element of hope, namely the doctrine of the Remnant, is conceded. It is around the question of the genuineness of the second pair of ideas that the battle has raged most fiercely. The doctrine of the Messianic King is found by the great majority of scholars in the two prophecies of the Wondrous Child and the Twig of Jesse,[6] and by some in the two Immanuel passages, 8 8 and 7 14. The doctrine of the inviolability of Zion is either expressed or implied in the great anti-Assyrian group of prophecies.[7] Our

[5] Harvard Theological Review, Oct., 1913.

[6] 9 2-7 and 11 1ff. 32 1ff. and 33 17 need not be considered, as the specifically Messianic interpretation of these passages is now generally given up.

[7] The anti-Assyrian prophecies may be divided into three groups 1) Those found in cc. 6—8 (the Syro-Ephraimitic prophecies), i. e. 8 9f.

first task, therefore, is to trace the fortunes of these two groups of prophecies at the hands of the neo-critical school.

PART I

THE NEO-CRITICAL SCHOOL

The gradual Elimination of the Messianic and anti-Assyrian Prophecies and the Concentration upon the ethical and spiritual Elements in the Teachings of Isaiah.

I. Wellhausen, Smend, and Robertson Smith.

In the earliest stage of the neo-critical development, the Messianic and anti-Assyrian prophecies were accepted unquestioningly as genuine. This phase may be best represented by Wellhausen in his *Prolegomena*, and by his two disciples, Smend in Germany and Robertson Smith in England.[8] If a composite picture of the views of these scholars may be drawn, ignoring differences in detail, it would be something as follows. 1) The first and chiefest characteristic of eighth century prophecy is its supreme emphasis upon the doom of the nation. "Only you have I known out of all the families of the earth; therefore I will

2) Those found in cc. 28—32 (the anti-Egyptian prophecies) 29 5-8; 30 27-33; 31 5-9.

3) Those independent of their contexts:
   a) Brief prophecies, 14 24-27; 17 12-14 (cf. 8 9 f.; 29 5-8)
   b) Longer prophecies: 10 5-34; c. 18; c. 33; 37 22 ff. (this last embedded in the Isaiah narratives).

4) To these anti-Assyrian prophecies may be added certain others in which the inviolability of Zion has been supposed to be expressed or implied: 14 28-32; 28 16; and c. 6; 8 18 in both of which the temple is prominent. It is important to notice that at 8 9 f.; 17 12-14; 29 5-8 and in cc. 18 and 33 Assyria is not mentioned by name, and in all but c. 18 "many nations" or "all nations" or "peoples" appear in its place. In 14 24-27 "all nations" are mentioned along with Assyria. This subordinate group will be hereafter referred to as "the many-nations" group.

[8] See *Prolegomena*; Smend, *Lehrbuch der ATlichen Religionsgeschichte*; and Smith, *Prophets of Israel.*

visit upon you all your iniquities."[9] This threat of national destruction has for its major premise a rigorously ethical conception of Jahweh and for its minor premise the fact of the nation's sin. The inevitable conclusion is national doom. 2) But such a conclusion is, in turn, the beginning of a new premise, namely, that religion must be dissociated from nationalism. A god who can destroy his own people in the interest of an ethical ideal is a god whose interests are not confined to his people. The religion of the prophets thus becomes incipiently universalistic; monotheism begins to develop. A fundamentally ethical god and a fundamentally national god have nothing really in common.[10] 3) Yet the judgment upon the nation is not an end in itself. It is only a means to an end. Beyond the judgment there is hope. But the circumstances in which the early prophets labored demanded warnings rather than comforts. Hence threats predominated in their prophecies over promises. 4) But in what forms did hope express itself? In the case of Isaiah, principally in two forms: in the doctrine of the Messianic king and in the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion.

A. Isaiah was the first prophet whom we know of to cherish the idea of a Davidic Messiah. As the breakdown of the monarchy during the Assyrian wars became steadily more obvious and more painfully felt, it was natural for the people to look back to the good old days of David and Solomon and to wish for their return. Is. 1 21–26, though not referring specifically to the Messianic king, is fundamental to the Wellhausen interpretation. The Messianic hope takes on the historical character of a hope for a restored kingdom. The Messianic kingdom is to be the continuation of the old Davidic monarchy. "The kingdom of God is for Isaiah absolutely identical with the kingdom of David."[11] The duties Isaiah ascribes to the Messiah are of political nature, such duties as one would demand today of the Turkish government. He is to give victory over the nation's enemies and to administer justice.[12] Such a hope could

[9] Amos 3 2.
[10] Cf. Smend, pp. 185, 193, 196, 199.
[11] *Proleg.* 434. Cf. R. Smith, 257, 302, 313.
[12] *Proleg.*, l. c.; Smend, 235, n. 2.

have naturally arisen, it is claimed, only in the eighth century. It could not have arisen *before* the monarchy, because it was attached to the monarchy. It could not have arisen *after* the fall of the monarchy in the post-exilic period, for at that time the hopes of the future became detached from history. The condition of the people scattered in exile no longer suggested a continuity in the political life of the nation. The hopes for the future now took on an eschatological character. The miraculous entered in. Furthermore, the particular hope of a Messianic King was no longer cherished, because another ideal had taken its place. The idea of the theocracy had, by this time, largely supplanted the idea of the kingdom (cf. Deuteronomy and P.); the church-state had supplanted the state-church and nationalism had succumbed to ecclesiasticism. Hence the doctrine of the Messiah could scarcely have originated at that time.[13] But if this doctrine could not have originated before the monarchy had arisen or after its fall, and must have sprung up sometime during its existence, there was no time so favorable for its birth as the eighth century. The Messianic hope was the natural antithesis to the Assyrian disaster.

In this construction four things stand out. (1) The rise of the Messianic hope is psychologically explained. The importance of this fact will appear hereafter.[14] (2) The Wellhausen view emphasizes the historical and ethical element in the Messianic figure. The supernatural is everywhere eliminated. 11 6 ff. is reduced to poetry and rhetoric. Continuity between the present and the future is insisted upon. The Messianic King is an ideal king, but the ideal is quite attainable. The charism which descends upon the Messiah (11 1 ff.) is not different from that which descended upon the ancient worthies except in its completeness and permanence.[15] "In his so-called Messianic prophecies Isaiah does not paint dream pictures of the future greatness and glory of his people for the realization of which there was not the smallest prospect, but sets up a goal which is or should be attainable in the present. The strong and just king

[13] This argument was worked out especially by Wellhausen, *Proleg.* 439.

[14] See Part II.

[15] Smith, 304.

of David's line in whose coming he hopes has nothing shadowy about him, and nothing is attributed to him which passes beyond the range of possibility under the conditions existing in Judah at that time."[16] This insistence upon the ethical and the historical in the figure of the Messiah is consistent with the emphasis upon these elements in the prophets generally, which is so characteristic of the neo-critical school; whether it is exegetically defensible in the case of 9 1 ff. and 11 1 ff. is another question. But at another point there is a latent discrepancy with the prophetic ideal. (3) How does the incipient breakdown of nationalism, due to the supreme place which ethics plays in prophecy, consist with the rehabilitation of nationalism involved in the Messianic hope? Smend is quite conscious of this difficulty.[17] He therefore holds that Isaiah's Messianic hope is no integral part of his thinking, a *merely passing phenomenon* in his life. Smend even goes so far as to suggest that it could not have originated with Isaiah, but must have been earlier connected in some way with the popular formulation of the doctrine of the Day of the Lord as a day of victory over Israel's enemies (Amos 5 18).[18] These observations of Smend will play an important part in what follows. (4) Lastly, it is rather significant that Wellhausen lays all his emphasis upon the view that the theocracy supplanted the nationalistic ideal in the post-exilic period, and ignores almost entirely the very striking Messianic movement under Zerubbabel. In treating of this movement he is concerned only with the importance of the temple in it. This leads us to our second point, the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion.

[16] Well., *Geschichte*, 123. In his final edition of his history Wellhausen thus maintains the position originally adopted by him.

[17] "Under the pressure of the Assyrian domination and in sympathy with the misfortune that had overtaken Israel in 734, there arose in Isaiah a nationalistic feeling which appeared to have utterly died out when he prophesied the doom of Israel at an earlier time. Again, that the Messianic king should be a descendent of Jesse shows us that the expectation of his coming grows out of the Jewish nationalistic feeling of the prophet." Smend, p. 232.

[18] Smend, 233; 235. Kautzsch also suggests the possibility of some older prophecy underlying 2 Sam. 7, in which this hope is expressed (H. D. B. Extra Vol. p. 695).

B. This doctrine we have found to be either expressed or implied in the anti-Assyrian prophecies which were accepted by all the early members of the neo-critical school with the exception of Stade. But why did Isaiah hold to the inviolability of Zion? This was a difficult question. The inviolability of Zion would seem, at first sight, to imply its sanctity in the cult sense. But this would not harmonize with Isaiah's known antipathy to the cult (1 10ff.; 29 13ff.), or with the supreme emphasis upon ethics in the prophetic message. Accordingly we find various answers, all intended to avoid the cult implications of the doctrine of inviolability. Zion, it is claimed, has no significance for Isaiah as a cult centre, but only as the seat of Jahweh's kingship. It is not thought of as his altar-hearth, but as his throne.[19] But would such a distinction ever occur to an ancient, even to an ancient prophet? Where does a deity manifest himself, where does he dwell, if not at the *sanctuary*? Isaiah, himself, saw Jahweh in the temple (c. 6). It is at this point, if anywhere, that the Wellhausen view exposes itself most clearly to the charge of modernizing the prophet. And further, does the inference of the inviolability of Zion as naturally flow from the idea of Zion as Jahweh's throne as it does from the idea of Zion as Jahweh's altar? The thought of inviolability almost inevitably suggests the thought of sacrilege rather than the thought of *lèse majesté*, and sacrilege suggests the cult significance of Zion. It is because these scholars feel this difficulty that they resort to another reason to account for the inviolability of Zion? It is connected by them with the doctrine of the Remnant, in the very characteristic form of that doctrine current in the neo-critical school. The idea of the Remnant, like the idea of the Messianic kingdom, is historicised and

[19] "We must not forget that the importance of Jerusalem in Isaiah's view did not depend upon the temple of Solomon, but on the fact that it was David's city and the focal point of his kingdom, the centre, not of the cult, but of the reign of Jahweh over his people. The holy mountain was for him the whole city as a political commonwealth, with its citizens, advisers, judges (1 26). [Note that its priests are not referred to!] His faith in the immovable foundation stone (28 16) on which Zion stood was nothing but a faith in the living presence of Jahweh in Israel's camp." (*Proleg.*, 25; for the same view see Smith, 361.)

moralized. The Remnant is the means by which continuity between the present and the future is established. It is the link between the two. It is a flesh and blood reality in history; it has a local habitation and a name. In essence it is the prophetic party, which began to form originally around Isaiah in the person of his immediate followers, gradually became consolidated into the Reform party, and ultimately put through the Deuteronomic law.[20]

But now the question would arise in Isaiah's mind, how is this Remnant upon whom his hopes became centered to be saved in the approaching national disaster? The way of escape is found in the preservation of Zion. Secure in an inviolable Zion, the Remnant is able to weather the storm.[21] In this way the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, which can so easily be interpreted in the non-moral terms of a taboo, also becomes moralized, and we arrive at a consistent interpretation of the Messiah, the Remnant, and the Inviolability of Zion, which emphasizes in each case the ethical and spiritual elements and tones down or entirely ignores the cult elements and the supernatural. But is this explanation of the doctrine of Zion's inviolability quite convincing? In general the anti-Assyrian prophecies either simply *assume* that Zion is inviolable, without giving any reason for it, or actually express the thought of its cult sanctity, as at 29 5–8; 31 9; 18 7. The view that it is to be preserved in order to afford a refuge to the Remnant is a pure construction of these scholars.[22]

[20] See Well., *Geschichte*, 123ff.; Smend, 229 ("The Remnant was not an object of hope"); Smith, 275. The main reliance of these scholars for this conception of the Remnant is 8 11-18, and, indeed, the passage is of supreme importance.

[21] "The sanctity of Zion rests at bottom, in Isaiah's view, only on the fact that in this place is the community of Jahweh" (Smend, 230). "Because the community of Jahweh [the Remnant] is indestructible, the state of Judah and the kingdom of the house of David cannot be utterly overthrown. The capital and the court appeared to him as the natural centre of the true Remnant" (Smith, 259; 289; cf. 263). This theory is worked out most fully in Meinhold's *Der heilige Rest*.

[22] The only two texts in Isaiah which by any possibility could be interpreted to express such a thought are 14 32 and 28 16. The first of

It is interesting, also, to observe that Smith is not quite satisfied with this explanation and suggests that the doctrine of inviolability is connected with Isaiah's nationalism. Isaiah simply could not believe that the state or its capital would fall. "The sphere of Jehovah's purpose and the kingdom of Judah are identical."[23] This means that the nation can no more be destroyed than can Jahweh's purposes be thwarted. But if Isaiah could not emancipate himself from a nationalistic interpretation of religion, is it so certain that he could rid himself of the idea of the ceremonial sanctity of Zion? When state and religion are one, the only way in which a national religion can express itself is through some sort of a ceremonial. If we run back the doctrine of inviolability to nationalism, it is, indeed, difficult to avoid the connotation of ceremonial sanctity. If, on the other hand, Isaiah *does* abandon the idea of ceremonial sanctity, and there seems to be very strong reason to hold that he did, is it not possible that he may have abandoned the nationalistic conception of religion with which the temple cult is so closely connected? In that case, did he, after all, teach the doctrine of inviolability? We have already seen how Smend felt the latent disagreement between the nationalistic doctrine of the Messianic King and the incipient breakdown of nationalism in the prophetic theology. We now seem to have uncovered, in the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, another disagreement of the same sort. Both doctrines, but particularly the latter one, present difficulties in the way of the Wellhausen moralizing interpretation of Isaiah, *provided they are genuine elements in the prophet's teaching.* This leads to the work of Duhm and Stade.

these expresses the thought that the Remnant (the poor and the afflicted) are saved because Zion is inviolable in itself, rather than the thought that Zion is inviolable because of the Remnant. I waive the question of the genuiness of 14 28-32; but see Duhm and especially Buttenwieser, JBL, 1917, p. 240 ff. The attempt to discover a Remnant at 28 16 (see, especially, Meinhold, *Der Rest*, p. 133 ff.) is labor wasted (see the author's article on *The Stone of the Foundation*).

[23] Smith, 263 f.

II. Duhm and Stade.

A. Duhm.

The significance of Duhm's work lies, first, in his peculiar interpretation of the teachings of Isaiah, the man, and, secondly, in his theory of the revision of Isaiah, the book.[24] 1) Duhm's interpretation of Isaiah's teachings is the exact reverse of the Wellhausen interpretation. Wellhausen lays all the emphasis upon the historical and the ethical, Duhm upon the supernatural, the religious. Wellhausen emphasizes the idea of continuity between the present and the future. The future is only an idealized present. Duhm insists upon the idea of discontinuity between them. He tells us expressly that Isaiah's "hope of the future is *not* in the idealization of the present".[25] Isaiah did, indeed, have the ethical interests which the other great eighth-century prophets had; these were expressed in his prophecies of woe. But his originality did not lie in them. It lay in his hopes; and these hopes are religious as distinct from ethical, supernaturalistic as distinct from historical. In other words, Isaiah's importance lies in the fact that he is the *creator of eschatology*.[26] The main proof of this thesis is found in the Messianic and anti-Assyrian prophecies. a) The Messiah is not a merely human king, he is a miraculous figure. His enduement by the spirit (11 1 f.) is a miraculous charism. The spirit does not *become* the spirit of the king, that would be an ethical conception; it *remains* Jahweh's spirit, that is a religious and supernatural idea. 11 3 does not refer to the ability to judge impartially, that again would be ethical; it refers to immediate intuition, due to the supernatural charism. The peace of nature in 11 6–8 is not a mere play of fancy, not allegory, not even symbol. It represents a real hope. It is to be noted that Duhm

[24] See his *Theologie der Propheten*, his great *Commentary*, and *Israel's Propheten*, 1916. Duhm's criticism went through a considerable evolution in these works, but his interpretation, curiously enough, remained practically the same.

[25] *Theologie*, 167.

[26] See, especially, his remarks at 1 17, and the additional statements in ed. 3 at 18 4.

carefully avoids the word 'mythological' in his interpretation of vs. 6–8, though he is impressed with the non-Semitic character of the passage. Again, the child of 9 1–6 is surrounded with an atmosphere of marvel. He belongs to the eschatological wonder-world *after* the judgment. All this is the exact reverse of Wellhausen's position. It may be noted in passing that the Wellhausen interpretation of the Remnant is also denied by Duhm. The Remnant is no longer the link between the present and the future. It, too, belongs to the eschatological era. Isaiah does not appear at the head of a prophetic reform party. "In the new creation he has no share because he is only a man. As any other man, he can only wait for it with faith and longing. It is an absolute miracle of Jahweh, and from it all human cooperation is jealously excluded."[27] b) But the most remarkable proof of Isaiah's fondness for the supernatural is found in the anti-Assyrian prophecies. The struggle with Assyria takes on the character of a mighty duel between Jahweh and this arrogant world power. "In an instant, suddenly (29 5), when apparently just about to accomplish its designs, Assyria is struck down by Jahweh." The conception is that of the *deus ex machina*. "The emphasis upon the suddenness corresponds to the tendency of Isaiah's politics and eschatology as a whole; not the smallest part of the victory must be ascribed to the people. Jahweh alone shall be exalted in that day."[28] Perhaps the most characteristic expressions of this thought are found in c. 10 and in the Ariel prophecy 29 1–8, the last verses of which compare the vanishing of the enemy to the vanishing of a dream. This last passage in its original form is said to be written *mit echtjesaianischem Schwung und Feuer*. Accordingly, Duhm views the attempts to interpret Isaiah along the Wellhausen-Smend-Smith lines as illegitimate attempts to modernize him. It must be admitted

[27] See the remarks on c. 6. The passage is considerably toned down in the 3rd ed. The same idea is still expressed, though more cautiously, in *Israel's Propheten*, 202. The failure to give an adequate analysis of the Remnant idea in any of Duhm's work on Isaiah is very striking. In keeping with this is the slight attention paid to Is. 8 16-18. The passage is not even mentioned in the *Theologie*.

[28] See remarks at 29 1-8.

that if the Messianic and anti-Assyrian groups are accepted in their present forms as genuine, this criticism of Duhm is correct. Duhm's exegesis of these prophecies does far more justice to their peculiar features than Wellhausen's. This is particularly true in the case of cc. 28—32, where the abrupt transitions from doom to hope lend themselves very naturally to Duhm's conception of a sudden, miraculous deliverance. But at this point we arrive at the second great contribution which Duhm's commentary has to give.

2) While in his *Theologie* Duhm still accepts only the results of the stage of criticism represented by Ewald, in his *Commentary* he subjects the first thirty-nine chapters of Isaiah to the most thorough-going criticism to which they had as yet been exposed. The results are astonishing. Never before had the extent of the revision been so clearly seen, never before had its purpose been so clearly recognized. For the first time we have in Duhm's commentary a thought-through theory of the revision of Isaiah.[29] Duhm advances what may be called a fragmentary hypothesis of Isaiah. The book is a prophetic anthology. The connections between the various fragments are for the most part artificial and due to revision,[30] and particularly glaring instances of them are now found in cc. 28—32, the very chapters upon which Duhm had specially relied in his *Theologie* to prove the abruptness and hence the miraculousness of the transition from despair to deliverance. The revision was, for the most part, made in the late post-exilic period and in the interest of late Jewish eschatology. *The original prophecies of Isaiah are thus set in a great eschatological framework.*

But the supposition that Isaiah, the man, was the creator of eschatology on the one hand, and that Isaiah, the book, has been subjected to a late eschatological redaction on the other, creates

[29] Stade had already suggested the outlines of such a revision, ZATW, 1881, p. 170ff.; 1883, p. 3; and in his *Geschichte*, I. p. 186, n. 1, but Duhm was the first *systematically* to apply Stade's principles to Isaiah. Cornill's theory of revision (ZATW, 1884, p. 83ff.), which combines a principle of chronological arrangement with a principle of catch-words, is by no means adequate.

[30] In the delimitation of the fragments Duhm's theories of Hebrew poetry play a large part.

a rather delicate problem. How is the early eschatology of the original prophecies to be distinguished from the late eschatology of the redaction? Of course it is easy to say that Isaiah's eschatology represents the seed and the later eschatology the full-blown flower. But in the realm of ideas this distinction is not always so easy to make. What Duhm fails to do is to provide us with adequate criteria in all cases for making the nice distinctions necessary. When Duhm tells us that the eschatology of Isaiah is fluid and the later eschatology has hardened into dogma, this is only the prose interpretation of the seed and flower metaphor.[31] But this gets us nowhere. In what respect are 10 12 and 14 32 allusions to accepted dogmas, while 29 5-8 and 31 9 are not?[32] As a matter of fact, I get the impression from Duhm's criticism that he trusts largely to style and poetic power in making his decisions. On this basis alone he might very well reject such slovenly and opaque prophecies as 29 16–24 or c. 4 and accept such forcible fragments as 8 9 f. or 17 12–14. But, though the presence of a bad style, when one is dealing with such a master stylist as Isaiah, may be confidently accepted as a mark of spuriousness,[33] it by no means follows that the presence of a good style within cc. 1—39 is necessarily the mark of genuineness. Later authors were quite capable of writing with force and even with grandeur.[34] After all, from the point of view of the critical school one must fall back finally upon the all-important *criterion of ideas*, and in idea are the anti-Assyrian prophecies so different from the later eschatological prophecies as to enable us to affirm with confidence that the former are seed and the latter are flower?

At this point a very disturbing admission by Duhm is encountered. We have seen how, in the case of the Messianic

[31] See his remarks at 10 12; 29 16 ff.; 30 18.

[32] Attention was called to this difficulty in Duhm's position already in 1913, Harvard Theol. Rev., p. 492. It is of sufficient importance, I think, to be worth repeating.

[33] Of course, a good style may at times become splotched with corruptions of the text (see c. 2), but in general it is not so difficult to distinguish between a passage that has become opaque for this reason and a passage that is opaque because there is an opaque mind behind it.

[34] Compare c. 14 for example.

prophecies, Smend admits a lack of connection between them and Isaiah's most fundamental convictions, and how, in the case of the anti-Assyrian prophecies, the same lack of connection is seen in Smith's interpretations, though Smith himself does his best to avoid this admission. What is our surprise to find Duhm cheerfully conceding both groups of prophecies to be fundamentally out of touch with Isaiah's great sermons of doom. The main interest in the prophecies of doom is ethical; the main interest in the eschatological prophecies is religious. The former come with divine authority, a "thus saith the Lord"; the latter are Isaiah's own private affair! This view-point, which meets us already in the *Theologie*,[35] is maintained by Duhm, with only slight modifications, in the three editions of his *Commentary* and in his *Israel's Propheten*. In all three works the Messianic picture in cc. 9, 11 and 2 2–4 are treated as poetry rather than as prophecy, originally written, not spoken; not designed for the people, but for the heart of the poet himself and for his immediate followers.[36] It is quite in keeping with this theory to find that Duhm refuses to explain the figure of the Davidic Messiah in chapters 9 and 11 out of the internal or external conditions in Judah. It springs out of Isaiah's own thoughts and character and experiences. Duhm suggests that Isaiah's nearness to the court and his respect for the royal prerogatives, as seen in the Shebna prophecy, might account in part for the rise of the hope in a Davidic Messiah![37]

[35] The passage is so important that I cite it in full. It is the opening paragraph of the section on Isaiah's eschatology. "Though directly attached to the immediately prophetic discourses, to those, namely, which are concerned with the present people and present conditions, the discussions more especially of the future glory appear to be quite independent of them. Through the omission of the formula, "Thus saith the Lord", these [oracles] permit us to see that the prophet speaks more on his own authority and for his own benefit, and does not intend to give his free expressions the authority which belongs to the word of Jahweh ... It is important to observe that the predictions of Isaiah [Duhm has in mind particularly the Messianic passages] are his own private affair and have no divine authority for others" (p. 158).

[36] Cf. *Israel's Propheten*, p. 179.

[37] *Israel's Propheten*, 186. He does not discuss the origin of the conception either in the *Theologie* or the *Commentary*.

Here is a singular situation! The importance of Isaiah is found in the fact that he is the creator of eschatology, and yet this eschatology is almost completely out of touch with his prophetic activity and with the great ethical interests which seem to have controlled him as a prophet. Our surprise is not lessened when we find Duhm pointing out both in the *Theologie* and in the *Commentary* that this same material, which is so little related to Isaiah's prophetic interests, is very closely related to Ezekiel and Deutero-Zechariah! Zechariah we are told "has the same heart-felt interest in miracle as Isaiah did."[38] In view of what may fairly be called the unstable equilibrium of Duhm's interpretation and criticism, the work which had been earlier initiated by Stade gains a new significance.[39]

B. Stade.

Stade's importance in the history of Isaiah-interpretation lies mainly in two things: his criticism of the Isaiah narratives,[40] and his criticism of the anti-Assyrian prophecies. 1) For the first time he subjected the Isaiah narratives to a rigorous criticism and showed that only the abbreviated annalistic notice in 2 K. 18 13–16 can lay claim to strict historical accuracy. The other two accounts which he unravelled out of the present compilatory tangle were regarded as legendary, and the anti-Assyrian poem attached to them (37 22 ff.) *and agreeing with their point of view* was rejected.[41] This conclusion was ominous for the future. Here was the only anti-Assyrian poem in Isaiah which seemed to be organically connected with a datable event (the campaign of Sennacherib) now regarded as spurious.

2) Equally disturbing was Stade's attack upon certain other anti-Assyrian prophecies. The point of view from which this attack was launched should be noticed. In determining the

[38] *Theologie*, p. 277; cf. p. 211. Compare also remarks in *Comm.* at 31 9, and the new passage in ed. 3 at c. 18, p. 114, and especially the change in ed. 3 at 29 5-8, p. 183.

[39] See his articles in the debate on Deutero-Zechariah in ZATW, 1881—'84, and *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 1881—'85, passim.

[40] Cc. 36, 37, cf. 2 K. 18 13-19 37.

[41] *GVI*, p. 617 ff.; ZATW, 1886, p. 173 ff.

genuineness of a prophecy *the criterion of ideas* was pushed to the front. If an idea appeared in one passage in a self-explanatory context and in another passage in an unorganized and unintelligible way, the priority must be with the self-explanatory passage.[42] Now the Gog prophecy in Ezekiel has been admitted on all hands to be a characteristic prophecy of Ezekiel and an integral part of his system of thought. It is a 'child of Ezekiel's reflection', to use a famous phrase of Smend. According to this prophecy, Gog marches at the head of "many peoples", mysterious hordes from the north, to attack the Holy Land in one last mighty effort to crush the people of God. But Jahweh's power and holiness are brilliantly vindicated in Gog's complete overthrow. Upon the mountains of Palestine his armies meet destruction, a sure proof that Jahweh's hand has accomplished it. But within the anti-Assyrian prophecies there is a small group, the "many-nations" passages (8 9 f.; 17 12–14; 29 5–8, and cf. 14 24–27 where "all nations" as well as Assyria are referred to), in which the same *motif* is found as in the Gog prophecy and expressed in much the same way. Here are many mysterious, unnamed peoples arrogantly combining against Judah but ultimately overwhelmed by Jahweh's power. Now, whereas the Gog prophecy is in the most intimate relation with Ezekiel's theological views, the "many-nations" passages, it is claimed, are out of harmony with Isaiah's views. The universalism implied in them is too advanced for eighth-century prophecy. But apart from this argument, which is not entirely convincing, the fact remains that these three brief prophecies are in fundamental disagreement *with their contexts*. In accordance with Stade's method it would seem reasonable to conclude that the *motif* in these prophecies originated with Ezekiel, and that the "many-nations" passages were incorporated into Isaiah after the time of Ezekiel.[43] This conclusion would also agree with one of the most celebrated dicta of Wellhausen. "Earlier", he tells us, i. e. in the preexilic period, "it was always an enemy already threatening in the background, a danger actually approaching; after the exile, fancy created a general conspiracy of God knows what people

[42] ZATW, 1881, p. 10 ff.

[43] ZATW, 1883, pp. 1—16; 1884, p. 260 n. 1.

against Jerusalem, for which in reality there was no occasion. Prophecy lost its connection with history and its foundation in history".[44] This statement would seem to fit exactly the "many-nations" passages in Isaiah. But may we not take one more step? The same *motif* is found in the other anti-Assyrian passages as well as in the "many-nations" group. It is interesting to observe how Robertson Smith characterizes Is. 10 in almost exactly the same language as Stade and Smend characterize Ezek. 38 and 39.[45] In both Jahweh's honor is at stake; in both the destruction of Assyria or Gog is necessary to the vindication of his honor. But in one particular c. 10 and certain others of the anti-Assyrian group differ from the Gog prophecy. They are expressly anti-*Assyrian*. They seem to oppose the *historical* nation, Assyria. The relationship of the anti-Assyrian prophecies in Isaiah to the Gog prophecy would then seem to be a good example of the seed and flower theory. The Isaianic prophecies could naturally be accounted for as originating in the great Assyrian crisis, an historical crisis. Ezekiel would take up the *motif* of the Assyrian prophecies and theologize or rather mythologize it. Unfortunately, the problem is not quite so easy of solution as that. Is Assyria in these anti-Assyrian prophecies always the historical Empire of the Tigris? At 14 24–27, a prophecy very much like the "many-nations" prophecies in style and temper, and in addition referring to the destruction of the enemy on the mountains of Palestine (cf. the Gog prophecy), Stade himself identifies Assyria with the Seleucid power.[46] But if this can be done in one case, why not in another? The question arises: When is Assyria not Assyria? When once the "many-nations" passages have been rejected, the fat is in the fire so far as the group of anti-Assyrian prophecies is concerned. It is impossible to prevent the question of their genuineness being seriously raised and discussed.[47]

[44] *Proleg.* 433.

[45] Smith, pp. 297—300, 333, 336; Smend, *Ezechiel*, at cc. 38, 39; Stade, ZATW, 1881, p. 44.

[46] ZATW, 1882, p. 291 f.; Duhm makes the same identification at 10 24; 11 11, and 19 23.

[47] Stade also rejected the Messianic passages, 9 1-6 and c. 11 (see *GVI*

Thus far I have sought to show 1) how Wellhausen, Smend, Smith and Duhm accepted the genuineness of the Messianic and anti-Assyrian groups of prophecies, and how two very divergent theories of the significance of Isaiah were based upon them; in one case all the emphasis was laid upon the historical and ethical, in the other upon the eschatological and the supernatural; 2) how, in the ethical interpretation, latent contradictions were discovered between the nationalism of Isaiah's eschatology and the fundamental conceptions of prophecy, and how, in the eschatological interpretation, all links betwen Isaiah's eschatology, which had a literary origin, and his prophecy, which was expressed in his spoken sermons, were practically destroyed; 3) how, in the third place, Duhm showed that the present book of Isaiah is a prophetic anthology compiled during the late post-exilic period in an eschatological interest, and how it became at times very difficult to distinguish the original eschatology of Isaiah from the eschatology of the redaction, and 4) how, in the case of the anti-Assyrian prophecies in particular, Stade established the closest connection between them and the peculiar views of Ezekiel. It is evident that the theory of a post-exilic eschatological redaction is entering into the problem of the genuineness of the Messianic and anti-Assyrian prophecies in a most disconcerting way. If it could once be shown that the groups of prophecies in question can not be adequately related to those prophecies of woe which are unanimously accepted, and can not be explained out of Isaiah's ministry, it would immediately follow that they must belong to this redaction. Hitherto only the more general discrepancies between these prophecies and Isaiah's fundamental ideas have been pointed out. It will be next in order to examine them more in detail in the light of the circumstances of Isaiah's day and of the purposes of his ministry.

vol. I, 596 n. 2, and vol. II. 209 ff.). But as he did not develop his argument against them, his hints at first made little impression. Not so his attack upon cc. 32 and 33 (ZATW, 1884, pp. 256—271). This was a powerful one. It so shook confidence in c. 33 that few have since dared to defend it; and c. 32, when accepted at all, has been accepted only with the greatest caution.

III. Attempts to Relate Isaiah's Hopes to his Threats.

In what follows I can select only the most outstanding problems presented by the prophecies of hope and treat them in the most general way.

A. The Messianic Group.

The first problem concerns the date and position of the Messianic prophecies in the life and teachings of Isaiah, provided they are accepted as genuine. So long as 6 1–9 6 is regarded as an organically constructed section, and Immanuel at 7 14 and 8 8 is identified with the Messiah, it follows that the doctrine of the Messiah was entertained at an early stage in Isaiah's career, for this section is definitely located at the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis in 735/734. But did Isaiah teach this doctrine later? The answer to this question depends upon the date of c. 11. The date of c. 11 was supposed to depend, in turn, upon the date of the foremost anti-Assyrian prophecy, c. 10, with which c. 11 appears to be connected. If, now, c. 10 is placed in the Sennacherib period, and that at first sight seems to be the most natural place to put it, it follows that c. 11 belongs to that period also. In that case Isaiah taught the doctrine of the Messiah at the end of his life as well as at the beginning.[48] But if c. 10 is placed in the Sargon period, as many scholars have held,[49] and c. 11 is still connected with it, then it follows that in the Sennacherib period, which is generally regarded as the climax of the prophet's career, the doctrine of the Messiah played no part. This is curious. But was c. 11 originally connected with c. 10? Guthe denied it,[50] and the work of Duhm confirmed his view.[51] But if c. 11 is cast loose from its present

[48] This is the view of Ewald. I omit, again, any consideration of 32 1 ff. and 33 17, for the reason that both dating and interpretation of these passages are extremely doubtful. The case for the genuineness of the doctrine of the Messiah in Isaiah depends upon the acceptance of 9 1-6 and c. 11.

[49] See R. Smith, and Cheyne in his commentary.

[50] See his *Zukunftsbild des Jesaia.*

[51] I think nothing is surer in the criticism of Isaiah than that 10 33, 34 are due to the later eschatological revision. The antithesis, therefore,

moorings, where is it to find a new anchorage? Guthe answered, at 9 1–6, the prophecy most closely akin to it. The result is to locate *all* the Messianic prophecies early, in 735/734. But how, then, is the disappearance of the Messiah in the later periods to be accounted for? According to Robertson Smith the doctrine of the Messianic King originated in the Syro-Ephraimitic period as an antithesis to the wicked Ahaz. The doctrine was still cherished as late as the Sargon period in Hezekiah's reign, for in his earlier years Hezekiah was not so good as he is generally supposed to be. But when Hezekiah repented in the Sennacherib campaign, it was not so necessary to rely upon a Messiah. The Messiah being only an ideally human king (the Wellhausen interpretation), Isaiah was able to emphasize the glorious reign of Jahweh, himself, through his historical representative, Hezekiah, now turned from his evil ways. In other words, the Messiah becomes so humanized by Smith along the Wellhausen lines that the rule of a good human king, even though he has just been converted, makes him superfluous. Guthe, on the contrary, adopts the eschatological interpretation of the Messiah in cc. 6—9. In 735 the situation was so bad that Isaiah was unable to hope for deliverance except through the miraculous intervention of an eschatological Messiah (again set in antithesis to Ahaz). But later the situation became improved in the reign of the good king Hezekiah (good all through his reign). Jerusalem was now practically identified with the Remnant, or at least the Remnant, as the reformed party, was located in Jerusalem. Consequently, when danger threatened from Assyria, Isaiah's view changed. He no longer expected a miraculous deliverance, but an historical one. The doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, interpreted in the interest of historical continuity (Wellhausen), took the place of the Messiah eschatologically interpreted.[52] This theory of Guthe is followed by Giesebrecht[53] and Procksch.[54] The latter introduces

which seems now to exist between the felled Assyrian forest and the twig of Jesse is not an original antithesis, but an artificially created one. I cannot feel that Miss Smith (JBL 1917, p. 167 f.) has succeeded in disproving this critical result.

[52] *Zukunftsbild*, p. 12 ff. [53] *Beiträge*, p. 76 ff.

[54] *Geschichtsbetrachtung*, 38, n. 1; 43, n. 1.

an interesting variation. He recognizes that the Messianic idea is essentially nationalistic. Therefore, when the great doctrine of faith, Isaiah's supreme acquisition in 735, had been given time logically to work itself out, and when a non-nationalistic interpretation of the Remnant had dawned on him, the more nationalistic doctrine of the Messiah gradually faded away. But Procksch sees that the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, which takes the place of the doctrine of the Messiah, has its own nationalistic limitations. He therefore seeks to spiritualize the latter doctrine. It does not grow out of a conception of Zion as a cult centre, or as a royal city, but rather as the seat of God's spiritual presence, to be apprehended by faith alone (28 16).[55] The artificiality of all these expedients is obvious, and their forced character betrays the difficulties of the problem.

Duhm strikes out on a different path, but on a very dangerous one. The identification of Immanuel with the Messiah at 7 14 is rightly denied,[56] and the Immanuel of 8 8, 10 is dislodged by a text-critical process. With these two anchors gone, Duhm is prepared to take the next step and disconnect 9 1–6 altogether from the Syro-Ephraimitic prophecies.[57] The consequence is that the only two prophecies, 9 1–6 and c. 11, the Messianic interpretation of which is secure, are cast completely adrift. They

[55] P. 58ff.

[56] See Porter's article JBL 1895, and my article in AJSL July, 1918, which seek to confirm, along a different line, the non-Messianic character of Immanuel.

[57] The Syro-Ephraimitic prophecies come to an appropriate and effective conclusion in the epilogue, 8 16-18. What follows in vs. 19-22, whatever it may mean, has nothing to do with the subject of cc. 6—8. 8 23 is altogether too uncertain to furnish a reliable connection between 9 1-6 and the historical situation. It is a gloss to connect 9 1 with 8 19-22. There is also another reason why 9 1-6 cannot have originally been connected with the Syro-Ephraimitic prophecies. The only adequate reason which has ever been offered for the present position of c. 6 is that it was placed here by Isaiah himself as an introduction to the account of the events in 735 recorded in cc. 7 and 8, in order to explain the failure of Isaiah at that time to carry through his policies. In that case it would be most unlikely for him to end his account of the events of this crisis with a passage, 9 1-6, which robs the introduction (c. 6), which he himself had provided, of all its point.

cannot be connected with any known fact or period of Isaiah's life. Duhm evidently feels this difficulty. He attempts to find a place for 9 1–6 in the midst of the Sennacherib campaign,[58] but he pushes c. 11 and 2 2–4, which is closely akin to it, to a time *after* this campaign at the end of Isaiah's life. These prophecies are supposed to be Isaiah's swan-songs, the yearnings of an old man. They were not prepared for a public audience, but for the inner circle of his followers. This is in accordance with Duhm's theory that Isaiah's eschatological poems have nothing to do with his prophetic career.[59] We see, now, what this boils down to. Because no place can be found for them in that part of Isaiah's life which we know something about, they are transferred to that period of his life which we know nothing about.[60] But if we have to go to the very edge of Isaiah's life to find a place for these prophecies, why may we not step over the edge altogether and look for them in a situation in which they can be explained more satisfactorily? Granted that the origin of the Messianic prophecies might be explained, as Wellhausen explained it, out of the general situation in Isaiah's day, *yet when they are examined in the light of Isaiah's other teaching and of his prophetic career,* a serious doubt arises whether they originated with *him.*

B. The Anti-Assyrian Group.

We have seen how certain scholars have held that the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion gradually supplanted the doctrine of the Messiah in the latter part of Isaiah's life. This means that

[58] His only argument is that v. 3 must refer to Assyria and v. 4 to the army of Sennacherib. Why?

[59] See above, n. 35.

[60] It would have been well if 9 1-6 had been placed with c. 11 and 2 2-4. In my article on *A New Chapter in the Life of Isaiah,* I have suggested that some light may be thrown upon the closing days of Isaiah by the Shebna prophecy, but even if the suggestions there given were accepted, they would furnish no explanation of these Messianic prophecies in this late period. Staerk (*Das Assyrische Weltreich,* p. 216 f.), gives up the attempt to date the Messianic prophecies more precisely or to constitute a development in them.

the anti-Assyrian prophecies, in which this doctrine finds expression, are pushed down into this later period. Is this admissible? Can we find an intelligible place for them either here or anywhere else in Isaiah's life? If this cannot be done, then, of course, the close connection established between this group of prophecies and Ezekiel's theology becomes doubly significant. In the criticism of the anti-Assyrian prophecies there are three crucial questions: 1) The historicity of the Isaiah narratives; 2) the date of c. 10; and, more important than this; 3) the date and integrity of the anti-Egyptian prophecies cc. 28—33.[61] The first of these questions has already been treated. We are now to consider the second and third.

1) So far as c. 10 is concerned, wherever it goes the remaining anti-Assyrian prophecies usually follow. The date of c. 10 is therefore a controlling date for the group as a whole. But in what period is it to be located? This prophecy has been variously dated, at or about the time of Samaria's fall, 722,[62] about 711 (Sargon's campaign against Ashdod),[63] in the Sennacherib period (705—701).[64] The last date, which is favored, by the great majority of scholars, is the most natural date so long as the Isaiah narratives, including the anti-Assyrian poem c. 37 22 ff., are accepted. C. 10 in its present form echoes the same tones of assurance on the one hand and defiance on the other as 37 22 ff. But if Stade's criticism of the Isaiah narratives and the poem embedded in them is accepted, a serious difficulty arises. Is the great challenge to Assyria in c. 10 justified by the event? Does the picture of the abject submission of Hezekiah in the only passage allowed by Stade to be strictly historical (2 Kings 18 13-16),

[61] I call these chapters the anti-Egyptian group because cc. 30 and 31 refer expressly to an Egyptian alliance, and cc. 28 and 29 can be best interpreted if this alliance is assumed to be the historical background out of which they come (see *The Stone of the Foundation*, p. 15 f.).

[62] Eichhorn, Ges., Di., Kit. (but with inclination to 711), R. Smith, König.

[63] Hitzig, Guthe, Giesebrecht, Cheyne, Kuenen.

[64] Koppe, Eichhorn (with reference to vs. 5-27), Ew., Bredenkamp(?), De., Du., Hackmann, Volz, Whitehouse, Skinner, Wade, Marti, Wilke, Küchler. Gray does not commit himself to any date except one sometime after 717.

harmonize with the supreme confidence manifested in c. 10? Were the hopes in c. 10 fulfilled? If they were, then were the threats in which Isaiah so frequently indulged *not* fulfilled? If the threats were fulfilled, what of the hopes? Were they only dreams? This leads to our second question, the date and integrity of cc. 28—33, with which c. 22 is probably to be combined.

2) The section, cc. 28—33, has led, in the course of criticism, much the same sort of wandering life as c. 10, but there has been a growing consensus of opinion in favor of a date in the Sennacherib period, and c. 22 is also best explained out of the same period.[65] This date for cc. 28—31 (32, 33) and 22 may be

[65] The data which have been utilized to determine the date of cc. 28—33 are the following: 1) 28 1-4, which presupposes a date before the fall of Samaria (722); 2) c. 33, which is supposed to refer to the Sennacherib period; 3) the Egyptian alliance mentioned in cc. 30 and 31; and 4) the connections between cc. 28 and 29 on the one hand and cc. 30 and 31 on the other. 1) The entire group has been located in the Sennacherib period. So Hitzig, on account of c. 33. This position was soon abandoned, a) because of the impossible retrospective interpretation of 28 1-4 which it necessitated, and b) because it was soon discovered (Ewald) that c. 33 was an appendix to cc. 28—32 and therefore not determinative for their dating. 2) C. 33 having become detached, the group was located before the fall of Samaria (722) on account of 28 1-4 (so Ewald, Duhm in his *Theologie*, Delitzsch, Dillmann). 3) Meanwhile the suggestion was made that the group was not chronologically homogeneous. In particular c. 32 as well as c. 33 came under suspicion or at least was regarded as also an appendix. Accordingly, we have the following mixed theories which postulate different dates for the different sections of the group, cc. 28—31. (a) Cc. 28—30 placed early on account of 28 1-4, but c. 31 assigned to the Sennacherib period. So König, because of the supposed difference in the historical situations implied at 30 1-7 and 31 1-4. In this König has had no followers. (b) C. 28 early (cf. 28 1-4), and cc. 29—31 assigned to the Sargon period at the time of the Ashdod campaign (ca. 711). So Cheyne in his *Commentary*. (c) C. 28 early (cf. 28 1-4), and cc. 29—31 placed in the Sennacherib period. So Robertson Smith, Kuenen, Guthe (*Das Zukunftsbild des Jesaia*), Bredenkamp, Orelli. (d) Only 28 1-4 early, the rest of c. 28 and c. 29 assigned to the late Sargon period, after 711, and cc. 30 and 31 to the Sennacherib period. So Duhm and Küchler. (e) 28 1-4 early, and the remainder of cc. 28—31 assigned to the Sennacherib period. So Stade, Giesebrecht, with some qualifications, Hackmann, Volz, Cheyne in his *Introduction*, Wilke, Staerk, Hölscher. It will be seen from the foregoing that there is the strongest tendency to bring the

regarded as the first great premise of a new construction of Isaiah in which the anti-Assyrian prophecies are rejected. The second premise is derived from the criticism of these prophecies.

When cc. 28—31 are attentively examined, a most curious phenomenon is discovered, the regular interchange of hope and threat.[66] The alternation is so consistent as to warrant the conclusion that it is deliberate. In the earlier stages of criticism this curious fact does not seem to have attracted much attention. Ewald, it is true, felt the difficulty, for he says that in these chapters Isaiah is addressing different groups of people. Duhm in his *Theologie*, accepts the sequences as they stand, and, as we have seen, derives from the abruptness of the changes from gloom to hope support for his theory of the miraculousness of the future era. The change to it is so sudden and complete that it must be effected by Jahweh himself. Guthe, also, accepts the sequences, apparently without misgiving. Giesebrecht, however, was somewhat staggered by one instance of them, namely 28 5f.

group as a whole, with the exception of 28 1-4, down to the Sennacherib period, and I will assume the correctness of this view. It is based on two premises: a) the immediate connection between cc. 28 and 29 with cc. 30 and 31, and b) the identification of the Egyptian alliance in cc. 30 and 31 with the one known to have existed in the Sennacherib period. It would take us too far afield to attempt to establish the validity of these two premises in the present discussion, but they underlie all the argument that follows. Anyone who wishes to attack its conclusions must show the incorrectness of these premises. As to c. 22, for our purposes only the dating of 22 1-14 need be noticed. a) It is placed just after the accession of Hezekiah. So Ewald; according to him in 727. b) Assigned to the Sargon period. So Kleinert, Bredenkamp, Cheyne in his *Commentary*. c) Assigned to the Sennacherib period *before* or *during* the invasion. So Lowth, Koppe, Eichhorn, Gesenius, Hitzig, Knobel, Delitzsch, Dillmann, Orelli, Giesebrecht, Stade, Robertson Smith, Duhm, Wilke, Küchler. d) Assigned to the Sennacherib period *after* the invasion. So Sörensen, Guthe, Kuenen, Hackmann, Volz, Marti, Meinhold, Staerk. The passage is not homogeneous, and I shall assume in what follows that the date of vs. 1-5 and 12-14, the passages which more immediately concern us, can safely be fixed in the Sennacherib period, but *before* the invasion. Hence these verses are to be grouped with cc. 28—31. See an outline of the argument for this date of c. 22 in the writer's article on *The Book of Isaiah*, The Harvard Theological Review, pp. 516 ff.

[66] See Table p. 70.

These verses are in flat contradiction with what Giesebrecht considered to be Isaiah's earliest messages of doom. He advanced the theory that these early threats were subsequently modified by Isaiah himself through the addition of vs. 5 and 6, when the historical condition had changed, and that, still later, the passage was revised again by the addition of the threats in vs. 7–22 which came out of the Sennacherib period and which in turn recalled the promise in vs. 5, 6.[67] In connection with his assignment of 28 7–22 to the Sennacherib period Giesebrecht made another observation of fundamental importance. Hitherto the general tendency had been to push the hopes in cc. 28—31 into the foreground and the threats into the background. *But when these chapters were placed in the Sennacherib period a difficulty arose.* On other occasions, as in the Syro-Ephraimitic crisis (cc. 6—8) or the Ashdod campaign (711), Isaiah threatened king and people if his advice, that is Jahweh's, was not followed. In the Sennacherib period the anti-Assyrian party which Isaiah had always opposed had got the upper hand and were leading the country into revolt. In cc. 28—31 Isaiah opposed this policy as earnestly as Jeremiah opposed a similar policy in later days. *Under such circumstances we would expect threats rather than encouragements*, and in consequence Giesebrecht laid all the emphasis upon the threatening elements in cc. 28—31. But have the hope elements in this group any place at all in such a situation? Of course, it is conceivable that both the threats and the hopes could have been expressed conditionally, according as the people refused or accepted the prophet's advice. But unfortunately both are regularly expressed unconditionally. Twice in the course of these chapters Isaiah, himself, says that the alternative had been presented earlier to them but that they had refused to follow the right way.[68] As a matter of fact the anti-Assyrian party did

[67] See his *Beiträge*, pp. 65, 68-71. This theory of various revisions by Isaiah of his own works is also utilized to account for the equally abrupt changes at 8 8-10 and 17 12-14. The similar changes in cc. 29-31 were explained exegetically. Giesebrecht's theory was of great value in calling attention to the problem of these curious changes, but his solution of it has died a natural death. It was too artificial to survive long.

[68] 28 12; 30 15.

have its way; the revolt was precipitated. How, then, could Isaiah give such encouragements as we find in these chapters when the people refused to follow him? At this point a formidable difficulty is uncovered. It is rendered still more acute when, on the one hand, c. 10 with all its trailers is brought down to the Sennacherib period and thus becomes associated with the hope elements in cc. 28—31, and, on the other hand, 22 1–14 is associated with the threats in these chapters. The unmediated transitions from threat to hope in Isaiah, especially in the anti-Assyrian prophecies, have occasioned more difficulty than any other single problem in the book. If both these threats and hopes are located in the same period, the Sennacherib period, as in the case of cc. 28—31, c. 22, and c. 10, the problem of their relationship to each other becomes doubly difficult, for the unchanging opposition to Isaiah's policies in this period would lead us to expect only denunciations, not promises. Furthermore, the question must again be raised: Were the hopes or the threats fulfilled? This depends upon one's views of the historicity of the Isaiah narratives which we have seen was seriously attacked by Stade. What happened in 701, a terrible disaster or a triumphant deliverance? Such are the factors in the problem of the anti-Assyrian prophecies with their expressed or implied doctrine of the inviolability of Zion. The chief attempts to solve this problem are the following.

1) Robertson Smith held that the change from threats to promises was due to the reforms of Hezekiah which he locates in the midst of the campaign.[69] This is in agreement with the Wellhausen insistence upon the ethical element in Isaiah. Deliverance is inconceivable without repentance. Smith assumed the present order and historicity of the Isaiah narratives according to which 2 K. 18 13–16 is the first episode in the Sennacherib campaign against Judah, and he locates the reforms between 2 K. 18 13–16 and 18 17 ff. But if Stade's criticism of the

[69] Delitzsch and Orelli seek to mediate from threat to promise also through the goodness of Hezekiah. The main interest of these men is in the principles of prophetic fulfilment, and their work is therefore dominated by the apologetic, rather than the historical, interest in the above questions.

Isaiah narratives is accepted, Smith's theory cannot be carried through.

2) Dillmann assigns both cc. 28—32 and c. 10 to earlier periods in Isaiah's life[70] and thus seems to relieve the violent contrast between them which exists if both groups of prophecies are placed in the Sennacherib period. But this is of little avail as long as he keeps the equally contradictory prophecies, c. 22 and c. 37 22 ff., in this period. He says: the former threats have been fulfilled in 2 K. 18 13–16; as the facts speak for themselves, it is no longer necessary to renew them; the time is now ripe for promises. But is not c. 22 a threat and the most unqualified of all? Yes, but though it is also placed after 2 K. 18 13–16, it is only an episode, Dillmann tells us, only a momentary outburst of anger!

3) The usual theory has been that Isaiah was so outraged by the blasphemous arrogance of Assyria as to overlook, for the time being, the sins of Judah. This theory is based mainly on 10 5–15 and it emphasizes the religious rather than the ethical interest. Assyria is guilty either of *lèse majesté* against Jahweh or sacrilege against his temple. This theme is repeated with almost endless variations by scholars of all schools.[71] The fundamental objection

[70] See above, n. 62, 65.

[71] E. g. Ewald (a classic formulation of this theory), Stade (in his *Geschichte*), Guthe, Giesebrecht, Driver (*Isaiah*, in the Men of the Bible Series), Küchler, Wilke, Kittel. Sometimes the conflict between the hope and the doom prophecies is dulled a little by referring them to different periods. Ewald places cc. 22, 28—32 before 722 but c. 10 and the anti-Assyrian prophecies in the Sennacherib period. Guthe and Giesebrecht reverse this and place cc. 22, 28—31 (in part) in the Sennacherib period and c. 10 earlier. Such methods do nothing to relieve the difficulties of the abrupt changes within cc. 28—31 or between c. 22 and 37 22 f. when both are located in the Sennacherib campaign. According to Driver, Isaiah forgot all party interests in the great national crisis, just as Aristides did in the crisis of Athenian history, and promises took the place of denunciations (as if Isaiah would encourage those who repudiated his policy!). The arrogance of Assyria must be challenged. "There are bounds which even a despot cannot pass" (*Isaiah, his Life and Times*, p. 69). Similarly Kittel: "When Asshur trespasses upon Zion, where Jahweh has his altar and where Isaiah himself in the most exalted moment of his life was honored with a vision of him, then is Judah's guilt forgotten for a

to it is that in the situation of the Sennacherib campaign promises are the last thing we would expect Isaiah to indulge in. He had spent his life in protesting against foreign alliances. Faith in Jahweh, not in Egypt, was his solution for the ills of the times. "Egypt is man and not God; his horses are flesh and not spirit. In returning and rest ye shall be saved; in quietness and confidence your power shall be. If you do not believe you shall not be established."[72] These are the expressions of the fundamental religion of Isaiah. His kingdom is the kingdom of the spirit and he sets it in irreconcilable antithesis to the kingdom of force. They are to trust in the gently-flowing waters of Siloah, symbol of the power of the spirit, not in the muddy, swirling flood of the Euphrates, symbol of the power of the material and the

moment—not for ever—and the judgment upon Assyria becomes controlling." (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*[2] II, p. 511). According to Dillmann the *anger* of c. 22 was a passing mood; according to Driver and Kittel, in the *promises* to Judah Isaiah momentarily ignored its sins. One of these explanations is just as improbable, when the historical situation is realized, as the other. Stade, in his *History*, having thrown doubts upon the historicity of the Isaiah narratives, logically holds that both threats and promises were fulfilled in the Sennacherib campaign, the former in the laying waste of Judah, the latter in the withdrawal of Sennacherib. But he has so reduced the glory of the deliverance that it is hard to think that it represented any adequate fulfilment of the triumphant challenges to Assyria expressed in the anti-Assyrian prophecies. In Küchler's view Judah does not escape by any virtue of its own but solely because Assyria, owing to its brutality and arrogance, is not a fitting instrument with which to punish it. But further, he adopts Stade's criticism of the Isaiah narratives and draws the inference, which Stade himself did not at first draw so bluntly, that Isaiah's promises were not fulfilled in any true sense. Jerusalem was spared, but Sennacherib accomplished all he desired to do. Wilke draws a sharp distinction between Isaiah's attitude down to the Sennacherib period and his attitude *in* that period. Before the campaign he had been consistently favorable to Assyria, but in the Sennacherib period he was opposed to it. The primary reason was not a change in Judah, though Wilke refers to Hezekiah's reforms, but a change in Assyria! Wilke, following Winckler, draws a contrast between the reforming king, Tiglath-Pileser, and the later savage brutality of Sennacherib! The attempt of Winckler and Wilke to construe the so-called pro-Assyrian policy of Isaiah as a policy in any true sense favorable to Assyria is totally to misconceive the real teachings of the prophet.

[72] Is. 31 3; 30 15; 7 9.

fleshly.[73] All this was impractical idealism, if you will, but it was the heart of Isaiah's message to the world. Now the point is, in the Sennacherib campaign Judah did the very thing against which Isaiah had protested all his life and in no oracles more powerfully than in cc. 28—31. The anti-Assyrian party got complete control, repudiated the advice of Isaiah and formed an alliance with Egypt. Would Isaiah now turn around and, in the face of this complete apostasy, promise deliverance? It is unthinkable. The suggestion that even for a moment he could have forgotten the sin of Judah, now in open rebellion against the word of Jahweh spoken through him, cannot be, itself, for a moment entertained. It would mean that he had not only forgotten Judah's sins, but the very essence of his own mission.

4) Though Duhm does not refer to the difficulty just mentioned, he seems to be subconsciously aware of it. At least that seems to be the clue to his treatment of the anti-Assyrian prophecies. Like the Messianic prophecies, they are not intended for a general audience, but rather for the group of believers which gathered round him.[74] This theory would get rid of the difficulty which inheres in the supposition that these challenges to Assyria were hurled against it in public, in which case Isaiah would have only strengthened the anti-Assyrian policy which he was in reality opposing. But is there any evidence in the anti-Assyrian prophecies as they now stand that they were spoken in private? Not one bit of reliable evidence is produced for such a theory.[75] It is possible to hold it only after the most drastic criticism of this group has been made.[76]

[73] 8 5-8.

[74] See *Commentary*, Ed.[1], at 29 1-8; 30 27-33, pp. 182, 195, 201. Staerk, also, p. 123, avails himself of this theory, though his final solution of the problem is a different one (see below).

[75] Duhm's treatment of the entire group of anti-Assyrian prophecies incidentally suggestive as it is, must be considered quite inadequate. The dates for those which are received are generally assumed rather than proved; the criticism of them is in unstable equilibrium, for some are rejected while others are retained without adequate justification for the discrimination; and the problem which they present, if placed in Isaiah's life-time, and the conflict between them and Isaiah's message receive no adequate discussion.

[76] See below, p. 49, n. 107.

5) Overwhelmed by the difficulties of finding any place or meaning for the anti-Assyrian group of prophecies in the lifetime of Isaiah down to and including the Sennacherib campaign of 701, Staerk seeks a place for them still later, in connection with a conjectured second campaign of Sennacherib. His two chief reasons for this solution are: a) his acceptance of the logic of Stade's criticism of the Isaiah narratives and consequent denial of any marvelous deliverance of Jerusalem in 701; and b) the psychological impossibility of Isaiah promising deliverance in 701 to a people who were in the act of rebelling against Jahweh's will.[77] The terrible devastation to which Judah was subjected in 701 caused Isaiah to change his views of Assyria. The ὕβρις of this military power must be rebuked; hence, when Sennacherib came again against Jerusalem, Isaiah prophesied his overthrow.[78] It is interesting to observe how Staerk pushes the anti-Assyrian group down into an unknown period of Isaiah's life, just as Duhm pushes the Messianic group into the same period. This feeling that neither group of prophecies can be adequately explained out of that part of Isaiah's life of which we have definite information is a very suspicious circumstance. Further, the fact that thus far no reliable evidence of a second campaign against Jerusalem has been discovered is an obstacle of the most formidable kind to the solution which I originally proposed, and, failing such evidence, I have been reluctantly compelled to resort to another solution (see below).

[77] *Das Assyr. Weltreich*, pp. 81 ff., 86 ff., 105—124. The theory of two campaigns of Sennacherib was first proposed by Winckler (*Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, 1892). This solution of the problem of the anti-Assyrian prophecies was already suggested by me two years before the appearance of Staerk's work in a discussion of the two-campaign theory of the Isaiah narratives. (See *The Invasion of Sennacherib*, in particular p. 634, n. 134.) I still believe that this theory affords the readiest means yet proposed for the defense of the anti-Assyrian group. It is also adapted by Baentsch (ZWTh, 1908, p. 470).

[78] Staerk thus ranges himself with the writers referred to above in n. 71, though he places the change in Isaiah's attitude toward Assyria *after* 701 rather than in the campaign.

IV. The Final Neo-Critical Assault upon the Messianic and Anti-Assyrian Prophecies.

In view of the foregoing discussion, it is not to be wondered at that in the later phases of the neo-critical movement the genuineness of both the Messianic and anti-Assyrian groups of prophecies should have been seriously questioned. Hackmann, Cheyne and Volz[79] delivered the main attack against the Messianic group; Marti, Stade, and Beer carried on the operations begun by Stade against the anti-Assyrian group.[80]

A. The Messianic Group.

In the case of the Messianic prophecies, two main features in them, to which the earlier criticism had failed to do justice, were now urged against them.[81] 1) The first is their nationalism. Is the Messiah a political figure with a dash of religion and morals, or a religious and ethical figure with a dash of politics? Because of the close association of the Messianic king with the Davidic dynasty the former view would seem to be the more nearly correct one. His functions are neither priestly nor prophetic. But in that case there is a latent contradiction between the Messianic ideal and the prophetic opposition to nationalism. We have seen how Smend seemed to be dimly aware of this contradiction.[82] Volz throws it into high relief.[83] He claims that not only is prophecy in general antagonistic to nationalism, but Isaiah in particular is in the most pronounced opposition to it. He unceasingly combatted the various expressions of nationalist activities, intrigues, alliances, trust in military power. Throughout his life he was in conflict with the Davidic dynasty, sometimes in the most violent conflict, as in 735, when he opposed

[79] *Zukunftserwartung; Introduction; Die Vorexilische Jahweprophetie.*

[80] *Kommentar; Biblische Theologie; Festschrift Wellhausen.* This phase of the neo-critical development is conveniently summed up in Hölscher's *Die Propheten.*

[81] Cf., especially, Volz for what follows.

[82] See above, p. 11.

[83] When König, in criticising this position, insists on the *Patriotismus* of the prophets (*Geschichte des ATR*, p. 410, cf. 382, 400, a. 4), he should define more carefully just what he means by it.

the pro-Assyrian policy of Ahaz, or in 705—701, when he opposed the pro-Egyptian policy of Hezekiah.[84] Would a man of these convictions clothe his hopes in a nationalist form? Of course, it is psychologically quite conceivable that Isaiah might not have realized the implications of his own theological position, and that, consequently, contradictory views might have been entertained by him. There is also the important prophecy, 1 21–26, which seems to look forward to the restoration of the golden age of the Hebrew monarchy, the idealized era of David and Solomon.[85] But several considerations make against this psychological explanation. a) So far as 1 21–26 is concerned, Isaiah no doubt seems to embody his ideals in a state organization, but this is the one undisputed passage in which he does do this, and it is highly significant that in just this prophecy, where, if anywhere, we would expect to find a reference to the Messianic king, it is absent. One can hardly speak of nationalism in connection with 1 21–26. b) Again, in the doctrine of the Remnant Isaiah developed a hope of the future which was bound up with his doctrine of faith, and which was the appropriate expression of the anti-nationalistic trend of eighth-century prophecy.[86] But the fact that he expressed his hope in a form

[84] Isaiah, it is true, does not seem to attack Hezekiah personally as he does Ahaz. Was this because Hezekiah really tried, though unavailingly, to make head against the anti-Assyrian party of his day? Or have Isaiah's attacks upon Hezekiah been deleted by the redactors of Isaiah because there was a tradition that the king had undertaken some reforms which these same revisers construed as deuteronomic in character? The fragmentary state of our sources permits of no final answer to these questions.

[85] The prophecy, 1 21-26, has often been used as a basis for the defense of the Messianic prophecies. Cf. Nowack, *Zukunftshoffnungen Israels*, p. 50.

[86] In cc. 7 and 8 there are hints of an important change in Isaiah's conceptions of the Remnant, due to the experiences of 735. The fact that Isaiah takes his son, Shear-jashub, with him when he makes Ahaz a promise of deliverance if he would believe (7 1-9), strongly suggests that Isaiah was still cherishing the thought of the possibility of Judah being saved, though the negative form of the condition also suggests that he thought the possibility to be remote. But when Isaiah turned to his disciples (8 11-18), after his vain appeals to the court (7 10-17), and to the

so entirely in agreement with his fundamental convictions shows that he must have been aware, to some extent at least, of the implications of these convictions. This makes the supposition that he was able to adopt the doctrine of the Messianic King because he was not aware of its latent contradiction with the essence of his own views quite unlikely. c) Finally, the psychological defense of the genuineness of the Messianic prophecies, which points to the possibility of a man entertaining contradictory views while they are still inchoate, and while their different implications are not yet fully realized, breaks down at another point. The hopes under discussion are not integral parts of any of Isaiah's prophecies, whose disagreement with their contexts would be obvious only to one who was familiar with the later developments of the doctrine. The Messianic prophecies are, on the one hand, in themselves very highly developed literary compositions, but, on the other, they are isolated blocks among Isaiah's prophecies and only connected with them by links demonstrably redactional.[87] Granted that it is quite possible for a writer who is unaware of the conflict of his own ideas to merge them at times into a *literary* unity, this is not the case with the prophecies under discussion. The idea of the Messianic King is nowhere merged with the doctrines of the Remnant or the Day of the Lord, or with national repentance or the doctrine of faith. Whatever points of attachment the Messianic prophecies may have with

people (8 1-4, 5-8a), it is difficult not to believe that he saw in his disciples the Remnant, and in so doing caught at least a glimpse of that distinction which we now know as the distinction between church and state, and which has proved such a decisive factor in the spiritualization of religion. It is true, the name, Remnant, does not occur again in any unquestioned passage in Isaiah, and even in c. 8 Isaiah does not directly call his disciples the Remnant. But the progress of the two chapters, 7 and 8, and the insistence upon faith as the fundamental fact in religion, which is Isaiah's great contribution to religion, unavoidably suggest the identification of the company of believers with the Remnant. This theory of the Remnant is particularly emphasized by Wellhausen (the Remnant is the party of reform) and Robertson Smith.

[87] Cf. the impossible verse, 8 23, and the artificial contrast between the forest and the twig at 10 33 f. and 11 1.

Isaiah's thoughts they are not revealed by the prophet himself, but are left to the exegete to discover. In view of the peculiarly detached character of these prophecies, the abstract possibility that Isaiah may have entertained fundamentally conflicting ideas cannot be regarded as an adequate basis for their defense.[88] Accordingly, the nationalism expressed in the conception of the Davidic Messiah is not what we would expect if Isaiah were the creator of the Messianic eschatology, and the psychological explanation that Isaiah could have entertained conflicting ideas without being aware of the disagreements, while abstractly possible, does not account for the peculiar literary isolation of these prophecies. In this connection the argument from the style of 9 1 ff. and 11 1 ff. might be introduced, but in the present instance this argument has, admittedly, little force.[89] Far more decisive is the argument from the historical background implied in cc. 9 and 11, particularly from 11 1, which seems to presuppose that the Davidic dynasty is no longer reigning. But to follow up the evidence would lead to a discussion of exegetical details which would divert us from our main argument.[90]

2) The second objection to the genuineness of these prophecies to which I would call attention is the large amount of the miraculous element in them. At this point Duhm senses their true nature more correctly than Wellhausen. The figure of the Wondrous Child and of the Descendant of Jesse is not a merely human figure, even though idealized, as Wellhausen and Smith would have us believe; it is an eschatological, that is, a miraculous figure, though strangely enough with historical connections. The child with the mysterious four names is no ordinary child. The attributes of equity and righteousness ascribed to the descendant of Jesse are supernatural charisms, and above all the peace of

[88] By way of contrast, 8 18b involves an idea, the localization of Jahweh on Mt. Zion, which is in latent contradiction with the incipient universalism of eighth century prophecy, but which is nevertheless, from a literary point of view, an organic part of the context (against Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*, I. 107, n. 2, and Volz, p. 43, who reject it).

[89] Hackmann, Volz, and Marti lay little emphasis upon it; Cheyne develops it somewhat more

[90] See especially Hackmann's forcible treatment of the argument from the historical background, pp. 135 f., 138 ff.

nature is a miraculous peace, a peace of the golden age.[91] All this contrasts sharply with the intense realism of Isaiah, with his vivid ethical and historical interests. At the same time it reminds of Wellhausen's dictum that it was in the post-exilic period that prophecy gradually came to be detached from history. It is no wonder, therefore, when criticism became fully aware of the perplexing problem created by the presence of these prophecies among Isaiah's literary remains, that it was gradually led to relegate them to a much later period. This is not capriciousness. It is method, and an honest method, too. Once granted Wellhausen's premise on the one hand and Duhm's exegesis on the other, and the attempt to bring these prophecies down to the post-exilic period becomes almost inevitable. Of course, if neither premise nor exegesis is accepted, the conclusion drawn from them might have to be revised. But here a third datum is to be considered.

3) Until the time of Ezekiel there is no reference whatever to a Davidic Messiah, and when he appears he is a very modest figure indeed. Little is made of him by Ezekiel.[92] If the usual views of cc. 40—48 are accepted, the figure of the Messiah becomes quite faded in Ezekiel's later period; if the views advanced in recent years by Begrich[93] and Herrmann[94] are adopted, and there is excellent reason for doing so, it is washed out altogether. This absence of all reference to the Messiah for over a hundred years is the strangest sort of fact if the Messianic passages in Isaiah are original. Its strangeness is increased by the further fact that when Ezekiel does refer to the Messiah, there is no evidence that he was acquainted with the passages in Isaiah. The same thing is true of the references to the Messiah in Jeremiah. Whether genuine or not, they show no literary

[91] It is interesting to observe how Wellhausen (*Geschichte*, p. 123, n. 2 f.) and Smith (pp. 301, 303) concentrate their attention upon 11 1-5 and turn vs. 6-8 into poetry, whereas Duhm and Hackmann (p. 145 ff.) emphasize the latter verses.

[92] Cf. 17 22-24; 21 32; 29 21 (?): and the more important passages 34 23 f. and 37 24-28.

[93] *Das Messiasbild des Ezechiel*, ZWTh 1904, p. 433 f.

[94] *Ezechielstudien*, 1908.

dependence upon Isaiah. Now Is. 9 and 11 are so striking that in later times it became customary to interpret Isaiah's other prophecies in the light of them, and yet we must suppose that they had no effect upon Isaiah's immediate successors![95] This

[95] It is this argument which gives pause even to the very cautious Kautzsch (see his article on *The Religion of Israel*, H. D. B., Extra Vol., p. 696). The argument would lose only a little of its force even if the prophecies of a Davidic Messiah in Jeremiah were admitted to be genuine. But I think it can be almost demonstrated that they are not. It would require another essay the size of the present one adequately to discuss the Messianic element in Jeremiah, but in view of Cornill's defense (see *Das Buch Jeremia* 1905) of the controlling passage, 23 5-6, a word upon it may not be amiss. 1) C. 22 is a later redaction of genuine criticisms passed by Jeremiah upon the last kings of Judah. With the exception of Josiah (22 10a) they are bad kings and come to an untimely end. The prophecy in its present form ends with the curse upon Jeconiah (vs. 24-28), the nucleus of which is certainly genuine; it says nothing about the fate of Zedekiah. 2) 23 1-4 is the usual antithesis appended to such grim passages in the prophetical books. The evil shepherds, i. e. the wicked kings in c. 22, will be removed (a quite unnecessary generalization after the concrete denunciations which had just preceded), and good shepherds will be put in their place, who will rule over the remnant of Jahweh's flock, now scattered abroad but one day to be brought back. Observe that vs. 3-4 are the appropriate antithesis to vs. 1-2 both in thought and form, and the passage, so far as it is intended to offset the gloom of c. 22, is complete in itself. 3) But upon 23 1-4 there follows the prophecy of the personal Messiah, vs. 5 and 6. This prophecy contrasts with the one in vs. 1-4 in form; vs. 1-4 are prose, vs. 5-6 are poetry. It contrasts in thought; vs. 1-4 refer to the dynasty, vs. 5-6 to the individual Messiah. Strictly speaking, vs. 5-6 are quite superfluous after vs. 1-4. Thus vs. 5-6 have every appearance of being an addendum. 4) But vs. 3-4 imply the exile and are therefore late (note that the word 'remnant', שארית, is found again in its technical, theological sense only in the doubtful passage 31 7; in cc. 40—44 it refers to the historical group left in Judah at the time of the exile, most of whom afterwards went to Egypt). But if vs. 3-4 are late, they carry with them vs. 1-2. If, now, the whole passage, vs. 1-4, is late and vs. 5 and 6 are an addendum to it, it follows that vs. 5 and 6 are still later. 5) Again, the word צמח in v. 5 is left unexplained. Why did Jeremiah choose just this word? Neither the noun nor the verb occur again in Jeremiah except in the spurious parallel, 33 14 ff. Jeremiah cannot be dependent upon Is. 11 1, as is sometimes supposed, for he employs a different word from those found there. Further, the word, though figurative in meaning, has no effect upon its context. If Jeremiah applied this name for the first time to the personal Messiah, we would expect its figurative

is almost incredible. Accordingly, when 9 1ff. and 11 1ff. have once been dislodged from their present connections, especially, as in the case of 9 1ff., from the prophecies definitely dated in

suggestiveness to pervade the prophecy. This is not the case. It stands absolutely unexplained and without influence upon the thought or expression of the prophecy. In other words it has already become a technical term. This is the really significant thing for the criticism of this prophecy, but commentators have strangely ignored it. This is probably because almost all commentators have been obsessed with the idea that Zech. 6 12f. is dependent upon Jer. 23 5f. The reverse of this is the true relationship. In Zechariah the word affects its context (v. 12b. The clause, מתחתיו יצמח, is improperly rejected by Mitchell, International Critical Com. ad loc.). Above all, in Zechariah the choice of it can be naturally and historically explained. It is a play upon the name Zerubbabel, which is best explained as meaning the "seed" or "sprout" of Babylon (So Sellin, *Serubbabel*, p. 23, and *Studien*, II 83. For this etymology see also Ed. Meyer, *Entstehung des Judenthums*, V, following Meissner and Strassmaier, Siegfried, *Ezra und Nehemiah* ad Ez. 3 2, Bertholet, *Ezra und Nehemiah* ad Ez. 1 8, Buhl, Mitchell, *Commentary on Haggai* ad 1 2. The etymology suggested by Haupt, JBL 1913, p. 108, n. 3, seems to me far less probable. But even if it were correct, it would not prevent Zechariah's punning play on the name). The attempt to get rid of the name in Zech 6 12 by the supposition of text corruption (Duhm and Marti) cannot be admitted as legitimate for a moment. The passage is corrupted, but not at that point. 6) When once the true relationship of Jer. 23 5-6 to Zech. 6 12 is recognized, another interesting possibility comes to light. Coniah is rejected though he is a signet ring upon Jahweh's hand. But Zerubbabel is to be a signet ring (Hag. 2 23). One who recognized the allusion to Zerubbabel in Zechariah's word, צמח, and remembered at the same time Haggai's reference to the signet ring, may very well have placed this oracle in its present position in Jeremiah as an offset to the terrible prophecy against Coniah. Cornill sees that vs. 3 and 4 are spurious and frankly rejects them. This has the effect of bringing vs. 5-6 into an antithesis to vs. 1-2. But this is to substitute a very poor antithesis for a very good one. Again, Cornill completely ignores the way in which the name צמח is introduced, which is the critically important datum in the prophecy, and concentrates his whole attention upon צדקנו. This name in his view is a play upon the name of the last king of Judah and occurs just at the point in the sequence of cc. 22 and 23 where we would expect a reference to him. Cornill paraphrases as follows: "Thou, Zechariah, wilt meet thy fate. State and kingdom will be destroyed. But one will come sometime who will be in reality what thy name signifies and what thou shouldst have been." The trouble is, there is nothing of all this in the text. On the basis of Cornill's own showing, vs. 5-6 are brought

735, and set adrift on the stream of criticism, it is by no means a surprising thing to find them landing upon the farther shores of the post-exilic period. In spite of the fact that Wellhausen originally defended these prophecies, it was the inward urge of his own principles that led his followers in the neo-critical school to this final conclusion. But can a proper psychological environment for them be discovered even in this late period? Before an attempt to answer this question is made, it will be well to follow the further fortunes of the other group of prophecies which have especially interested us, namely the anti-Assyrian.

B. The Anti-Assyrian Group.

The data already brought to light for the solution of the problem presented by the anti-Assyrian prophecies are the following: a) The legendary character of the Isaiah narratives. This character raises in an acute form the question of their reliability. Was there such a magnificent deliverance of Zion as is described in them? b) The similarity of the group of "many-

into antithesis to the many bad kings in vs. 1-2, and not to Zedekiah. If the purpose were to contrast vs. 5-6 with Zechariah, we would certainly expect an express reference to him such as we find to the other kings in c. 22. Furthermore, is it likely that Jeremiah would take Zedekiah's name as the key to a prophecy of the Messiah? Granted that Jeremiah does not indulge in such bitter personal attacks upon him as he does upon the other Jewish kings, and that he was a weak king rather than a bad king, he says nothing good of him, either. If a play upon his name were intended in the sense of the above paraphrase, it would certainly have to be expressed and not left to the ingenuity of later exegetes. Cornill's defense of this passage is ingenious, but anything but convincing. But if 23 5-6 are rejected, the other Messianic passages in Jeremiah can scarcely stand the test of serious criticism. Caspari (*Echtheit der Messianischen Weissagung, Is. 9 1-6*, p. 32 f.) gives a curious explanation of Jeremiah's failure to allude to Is. 9 1-6. The central idea of this prophecy is "*peace*". This idea was taken up by the uncanonical prophets and became their watchword in Jeremiah's day (6 14; 8 11). His opposition to the uncanonical prophets and their mistaken use of Isaiah's idea of peace accounts for his own failure to make use of it. In view of what follows Caspari's attempt to show a connection between Is. 9 1-6 and uncanonical prophecy is noteworthy.

nations" passages among the anti-Assyrian prophecies to the Gog *motif* in Ezekiel cc. 38, 39. c) The dating of cc. 28—33 and c. 22, *as a group*, in the Sennacherib period. d) The strong tendency to date c. 10 and therefore the other anti-Assyrian prophecies in the same period. e) The wellnigh insoluble difficulties presented by the abrupt changes from threat to promise within cc. 28—33, by the presence of threats in 705—701 if there was a glorious deliverance, and by the presence of promises in the same period when the historical occasion called only for warnings. In the face of such conflicting data is it any wonder that there has been a resort to criticism? In what follows I shall follow the logical rather than the chronological development of the attack upon this group.

1) In the first place, Meinhold followed a correct instinct when he began his series of Isaiah studies (unfortunately unfinished) with a thorough discussion of the Isaiah narratives.[96] The correct appraisal of these narratives is fundamental to the solution of the problems of Isaiah. The result of the discussion, which is based on Stade's analysis, is to show that, whatever happened in 701, nothing took place at that time to justify the feeling of absolute security and of proud defiance expressed in the anti-Assyrian prophecies in their present form. 2 K. 18 13–16 give us the only authentic description of the condition in which Sennacherib left Jerusalem. But the growing recognition of the legendary character of the Isaiah narratives inevitably carried with it a suspicion of the anti-Assyrian prophecy, 37 22 ff., included in them. These narratives, including the prophecy, did not originally belong to the collection of Isaiah's prophecies, but were taken from Kings, in itself a suspicious circumstance. Further, the prophecy agrees entirely with the temper of the narratives. If the narratives are untrustworthy, it becomes difficult to defend the prophecy which is embedded in them and agrees with them.

2) The present form of cc. 28—33 cannot be original. This has been a steadily growing conviction among all scholars of the neo-critical school, those of the right wing as well as those of the left.

[96] *Die Jesajaerzählungen*, 1898.

Ewald was the first to express suspicions of c. 33, which he assigned to a disciple of Isaiah. But it was Stade who first delivered the attack upon its genuineness from which it has never really recovered, and which at the same time swept away c. 32 along with it.[97] The appendices to the group having been thus disposed of, Sörensen, in 1885, raised the question of the integrity of the main body of prophecies cc. 28—31, by calling attention to the abrupt changes from threat to hope in them. But he gave only brief hints of the difficulties, and his work seems to have had little immediate influence. In 1890 Giesebrecht made a formidable attack upon the integrity of c. 28, but obscured the significance of his criticism by his untenable theory of a revision of the chapter by Isaiah himself.[98] Two years later (1892) Duhm's commentary appeared, in which he completely shattered the integrity of cc. 28—31 and discarded the bulk of the hope material in them as reflecting late eschatology. His criticism, however, remained in unstable equilibrium.[99] He still left to Isaiah 28 16, 28 23–29 and, above all, the three anti-Assyrian prophecies, 29 5–8 (written *mit echtjesaianischem Schwung und Feuer*), 30 27–33, and the nucleus of 31 5–9, especially v. 9. In these three prophecies the inviolability of Zion is either expressly taught or implied. Duhm's criticism was confirmed and the logic of it still further applied by Hackmann (1893), Cheyne (1895), Brückner (1897), and Marti (1900), with whose criticisms I venture to associate my own article on the *Stone of the Foundation* (1920). The result of all this work is to eliminate all the hopes from cc. 28—33.[100] These chapters now stand out grim

[97] ZATW, 1884, pp. 256—271.

[98] *Beiträge* pp. 54—71, 76—84.

[99] See above, pp. 18, 20.

[100] It is interesting to observe the effect of this further criticism upon Duhm in spite of his protests against what he regards as its artificial schematizing. In the third edition of his commentary (1914) he finally gives up the genuineness of 29 5-8 and 31 9. The importance of these concessions cannot be overestimated. They are the most significant changes in the new edition. In view of them, it is strange to find Duhm still clinging to the genuineness of 30 27-33. This turgid outburst of vindictive fury against Assyria is as little likely to have been written by the author of c. 6 as any passage in the book. Can it be that Duhm feels the

and unrelieved in their denunciations of the pro-Egyptian party and in their predictions of national disaster. We saw that our major premise for determining the attitude of Isaiah in 701 was the dating of cc. 28—33 in this period.[101] The minor premise is now furnished by the criticism of the group. The conclusion is inevitable: Isaiah was a prophet of woe in this period. But this, as we have seen, is in strict accord with what we should expect, for in 705—701 Isaiah carried on a desperate but losing fight against the pro-Egyptian, i. e. the anti-Assyrian, party. If, now, this conclusion is combined with the results of the criticism of the Isaiah narratives, we arrive at the further enormously important conclusion that *in the Sennacherib period Isaiah was not triumphantly vindicated in his promises but was tragically vindicated in his threats.*[102] The criticism of the Isaiah narratives has carried away 37 22 ff.; the criticism of cc. 28—33 has carried away c. 33, 29 5–8, 30 27–33 and 31 5–9. What becomes of the other anti-Assyrian prophecies?

3) C. 33 and 29 5–8 (remember Duhm's final rejection of the latter as well as the former) belong to the group of "many-nations" prophecies, 8 9 f., 17 12–14 and 14 24–27, which Stade had originally associated with the Gog *motif* of Ezekiel and accordingly rejected. 8 9 f. and 17 12–14 share with 29 5–8 the guilt of contradicting their contexts in the most flagrant fashion. 14 24–27 does not sin in this respect and, further, refers specifically to Assyria as well as to "all nations"; on the other hand, in tone and temper it is exactly like the other "many-nations" passages and is especially closely related to Ezekiel, cc. 38, 39.[103] When c. 33 and above all 29 5–8 are once rejected, it is not at all surprising to find Stade's original suspicions of the remaining

ground slipping from under his eschatological, supernaturalistic interpretation of Isaiah, and therefore clings desperately to a few remaining patches such as this? If this is so, his footing is very insecure.

101 Above p. 29 f.

102 Many scholars have been dimly aware of this revolutionary result to which their own criticism has been forcing them. But, so far as I have observed, they have not formulated it to themselves as precisely as I have tried to do in the above statement.

103 Cf. the destruction of Jahweh's enemies upon the mountains of Palestine with Ezek. 39 2-4.

prophecies of this small group becoming gradually intensified. There are left of the great anti-Assyrian group only cc. 18 and 10.

4) C. 18 is one of the obscurest prophecies in the book; but the conventional interpretation can hardly be correct, and any deductions from it as to Isaiah's attitude toward Assyria, which is not even mentioned in the prophecy (!), or toward the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, are precarious in the extreme.[104] There remains only c. 10. The case for the anti-Assyrian prophecies stands or falls with this chapter.[105] But here again Duhm led the way. All the chapter was rejected by him except vs. 5–9 and 13–14. His grounds for this drastic treatment have seemed convincing to most of his successors in the neo-critical school.[106] But, if even these remnants are left standing,

[104] The prophecy is usually understood to express Isaiah's polite refusal of an offer of assistance by an Ethiopian embassy, accompanied with an assurance that at the proper moment Jahweh will protect his own, and Judah's enemies will be food for birds and beasts of prey. But a) the land from which the embassy is supposed to come is not Cush but is located *beyond* the rivers of Cush, if the present text is accepted. b) The supposition that Isaiah addresses the embassy at v. 2b is very doubtful. We should at least expect שובו rather than לכו. c) The current interpretation of v. 1a as "an insect-infested land" is a singular mode of address for one who is supposed to be expressing himself with diplomatic courtesy. d) The interpretation of the description of the people in vs. 2 and 7 as complimentary is beset with the gravest philological difficulties. No one has felt this more keenly than Gray (International Critical Com., ad loc.), yet, after pointing out very ably the difficulties in the current interpretation, he lapses into it at the end of his discussion. Herodotus' description of the Ethiopians (III 20) has too much influenced the interpretation of v. 2. e) I would also call attention to the subjectless verb, יעובו, at v. 6. It is usually assumed that the subject of this plural verb is the Assyrians or the "many nations"; but there is no evidence in the prophecy itself for such an assumption. Moreover, what is the force of יחדו? If we might judge from an original prophecy, 31 3, the יחדו would naturally suggest Egypt and Judah as the associated victims. C. 18 very insistently demands a renewed investigation. Cf. also, Buttenwieser, *Prophets of Israel*, p. 278 ff. The above note was prepared before I was familiar with his similar criticisms.

[105] See my article on *The Problem of Isaiah*, C. 10. So also Beer. Beer's essay appeared before mine, but it was not accessible to me when my own article was written.

[106] The rejection of vs. 27b-32 may, however, be questioned.

they still imply the inviolability of Zion. Assyria would destroy it, but in so doing goes beyond the intention of Jahweh. Hackmann, Marti, Volz and Buttenwieser deny this inference, but their denials are quite unconvincing.[107] Hence my attempt at a solution in the article just cited along a somewhat different line. Vs. 5–7 a and 13–14 belonged originally together (vs. 7 b–9 may have been a parallel). The subject of these verses does not concern the *extent* of Assyria's conquests, but the *theory* upon which they were made. Assyria claims to make them in her own strength; Isaiah says, Assyria is only an instrument in the hand of Jahweh. The problem of the Assyrian conquests was the burning theological problem of the day as well as the burning political problem. Could Judah still trust in Jahweh who was not able even to protect his land from the invasion of Asshur? Isaiah, who was so preoccupied with the religious significance of the political crisis precipitated by Assyria, could not have avoided this question. At some time or other he must have answered it. His answer was not that Jahweh would eventually step in and save his people. That might have passed among the people. His faith reached higher than that. In spite of the coming destruction of the nation, he saw in Assyria only the instrument of Jahweh's righteous wrath. C. 10 in its original form, if my view is correct, is the highest expression of supernationalism to be found in eighth-century prophecy. To infer from it the ultimate deliverance of Zion would be the exact reverse of what Isaiah intended.[108]

5) But above and beyond the difficulties already encountered in the way of accepting the anti-Assyrian prophecies, there are three characteristics of them as a group to which, in spite of their obviousness, sufficient attention has not been paid. a) In this group we have a fairly large number of prophecies, some of them also quite long, purporting to deal with the military

[107] *Zukunftserwartung*, p. 106 n. 1; *Jahwehprophetie*, p. 53; *Commentary*, ad loc.; *Prophets of Israel*, p. 285 ff. Their exegesis is improbable, especially in Hackmann's and Buttenwieser's case who accept v. 12 also! Marti suggests striking out the initial יהוה as well as v. 12.

[108] In this reduced form c. 10 may have been first spoken to the prophet's immediate followers (see above, p. 35), but this cannot be proved.

power which dominated the horizon of every Jew and conditioned the mission of Isaiah for forty years; and yet, if the internal evidence of these prophecies alone is consulted, we could not date one of them with any certainty at a particular time in Isaiah's life. This is a most singular phenomenon when one stops to think of it. We would expect Isaiah to be as concrete in facing this terribly imminent fact of Assyria as he is in facing the anti-Assyrian party; yet not once does he allow a hint to escape him of the historical background out of which these challenges are supposed to be uttered.[109] Every one of them is expressed idealistically, rather than historically. They are theological rather than political. b) This fact gains further significance when it is associated with another fact. It might be supposed that the contexts would provide the historical framework out of which these prophecies are to be understood, even if the prophecies themselves do not do so. On the contrary, these prophecies are, as we have seen, frequently in historical or literary conflict with their contexts. It is they which furnish a large part of the material for the eschatological framework which surrounds the original prophecies of Isaiah and which so regularly cancels their threatening import.[110] c) Finally these prophecies regularly assume that Jahweh will protect Jerusalem. Such protection is taken as a matter of course. It is never explained, never justified. The ethical element is almost entirely absent. Immanuel, God is with us (8 10 b)—that text might be prefixed to all these prophecies. But is this not an extreme instance of religion in the service of nationalism?[111] If difficulty has been found with the nationalism of the Messianic passages, certainly this difficulty is greatly intensified in the case of the anti-Assyrian prophecies. Thus from every point of view—the difficulty of relating them to the various historical contexts of Isaiah's life, their suspicious relationships to their literary contexts in the

[109] We have seen that the interpretation of c. 18 as anti-Assyrian is more than questionable. 10 9 furnishes only a *terminus a quo* for v. 8 f., but nothing further.

[110] See the Table. The original part of c. 10 has been remoulded by the redaction in the same interest.

[111] See the prophetic criticism of this at Amos 5 14.

book of Isaiah, and the pronounced type of nationalism expressed in them combined with their general lack of ethical interest — these prophecies come under the gravest suspicion, and it should occasion no surprise that criticism has slowly but surely advanced toward their complete elimination from the collection of Isaiah's genuine prophecies.[112]

6) In the case of the Messianic prophecies we have seen how the silence that settles down upon them in the writings of Isaiah's successors is almost impossible to explain, if they were really composed by Isaiah. This silence was found to give added significance to the difficulties which an attempt to explain these prophecies as Isaiah's must encounter. Similarly, the doubts of the anti-Assyrian prophecies which originate in the discovery of their fundamental conflict with Isaiah's mission and message are also greatly increased when they are examined in the light of subsequent developments. Here two facts, far more striking than the later silence with respect to the Messianic prophecies, are observable. a) In the first place, in proportion as the *motif* of this group disagrees with the fundamental conceptions of Isaiah, it is in harmony with the fundamental conceptions of Ezekiel.

[112] In view of the above discussions Staerk's severe criticism of Marti is not pertinent. He says: "What Marti scraps together by way of exegetical arguments out of his own and others' notions with respect to the prophecies just mentioned, without once shrinking before the mutilated figure of Isaiah [lying] in the Procrustes bed of the 'religionsgeschichtlichen' theories, deserves to be commemorated as a document of an era in Old Testament science finally, it is to be hoped, superseded" (*Das Assyrische Weltreich*, p. 215 f.). This is spoken of Marti's view of the Messianic prophecies, but Staerk would undoubtedly apply it to Marti's attack upon the anti-Assyrian prophecies (cf. his remarks upon Marti's treatment of c. 10, p. 212). Kittel also protests against these admittedly drastic eliminations. He says with special reference to this method of avoiding the difficulties created by the anti-Assyrian prophecies: "In view of the no small number of such oracles, and in view of their character which, for the most part, either betrays its Isaianic origin or strongly recommends the assumption of it, I hold this way out to be absolutely impassable" (*Geschichte Israels*[2] II. p. 509). The wholesale denial of laws to Moses at one stage in Old Testament criticism seemed equally drastic to some scholars. The severity of the surgery in this present case is admitted; it is a major operation. The real question, however, to be decided is whether the disease is not so deep-seated as to require it.

Stade's original observation of the close relationship between the "many-nations" passages and Ezekiel has been substantiated, but it has been extended to the group as a whole. b) But equally important is a second fact of a very different kind. Jeremiah is in as violent antagonism to this group at one point as Ezekiel is in hearty sympathy with it at another. The doctrine of the inviolability of Zion which is preached in these prophecies is the doctrine preached by those great exponents of nationalism, the uncanonical prophets, in other words, the doctrine which Jeremiah spent the greater part of his life in opposing. Scholars have vainly tried to tone down this aggressively obvious fact. What for Isaiah is a matter of faith is, they tell us, for his followers a dead dogma. Isaiah did not base his doctrine of the inviolability of Zion on the fact that it was the cult centre, as those who came after him supposed; the Deuteronomists, who regarded Zion in this light, quite misunderstood him. That is, according to these scholars, they quite misunderstood the anti-Assyrian prophecies. But did they? Duhm, who argues along these lines, has to admit that not the Deuteronomists, but he, himself, has misunderstood a couple of the most important of these prophecies.[113] After explaining, in the first edition of his commentary, their relationship to the later eschatology as that of seed to flower, in the third edition he concludes that they themselves are the flower. No, if Isaiah was responsible for the anti-Assyrian prophecies, the Deuteronomists did *not* misunderstand him, but built upon his work and could do so with a perfectly good conscience. The doctrine of the inviolability of Zion expressed in these prophecies is not explained or justified; it is simply assumed. In other words, it has already become a full-blown dogma, ready to the Deuteronomist's hands. In that case a violent and most unfortunate contradiction is constituted between Jeremiah and Isaiah, the two most outstanding figures in Old Testament prophecy.[114] Here is a remarkable situation.

[113] See above pp. 18, 46 on 29 5-8 and 31 5-9.

[114] Westphal recognizes, quite frankly, the fact of this contradiction. "The conviction of Zion's inviolability, apparently first cherished and expressed by Isaiah, burned intensely among the people; it became a popular idea against whose dangerous consequences the later prophets,

In their fundamental religious and ethical outlook there is a remarkable agreement between the two men. Isaiah's doctrine of faith and his doctrine of the Remnant naturally lead on to that great development of inwardness in religion and of the importance of the individual which makes Jeremiah's message so epochal in the history of religion. In Jeremiah we see the break with a nationalistic conception of religion, implicit in the two doctrines of Isaiah just mentioned, still further accentuated. The hearts of the two prophets beat in unison. On the other hand, the two doctrines which have been discovered to be most out of accord with Isaiah's theology and political activities, namely the doctrine of the Messianic king and the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, are either entirely ignored[115] or positively opposed by Jeremiah. But, it may be said, the fact that Jeremiah does not agree with Isaiah does not necessarily make against the genuineness of the doctrine of inviolability in Isaiah. It is not necessary, except on the traditional theory of inspiration, that prophets should always agree. As a matter of fact, does not Ezekiel disagree with Jeremiah at a point closely allied to the disagreement predicated between Jeremiah and Isaiah? He does, but the disagreement in the former case can be very readily accounted for. Ezekiel has adopted *con amore* the deuteronomic theories of the central sanctuary and its holiness; but in the circumstances this was the natural thing for him to do. It was the deuteronomic theory of the cult significance of Zion

like Micah and Jeremiah, were obliged to contend" (*Jahwe's Wohnstätten*, p. 176). The later theory, he tells us again, is to be referred back to "possibly *in part* misunderstood sayings of Isaiah". What is the reason for this cautious qualification "in part"? Does it betray Westphal's uneasy feeling that after all these prophecies were *not* misunderstood? In an article in the Church Quarterly Review for 1912 on *The Book of Isaiah. A New View*, Burney has this significant sentence: "We can imagine Jeremiah's opponents quoting Isaiah's words against him and reminding him how the earlier prophet's patriotic [note the word] policy had been triumphantly vindicated in the event" (p. 107). Cf. Smend's statement at the end of his discussion of the anti-Assyrian prophecies: "Isaiah prepared the way for Judaism" (*Religionsgeschichte*, p. 239). See, also, above, n. 95, end, and Sellin, *Prophetismus*, p. 52.

[115] See above, n. 95.

that helped to preserve the unity of the people in the suffering of the exile. Whatever criticism may be passed upon the doctrine of centralisation from the point of view of a pure spiritual religion, undoubtedly it did a great service during the exile, and a deeply religious man, such as Ezekiel unquestionably was, may well have attached himself to this theory, even though it had been opposed by Jeremiah at a time when the historical circumstances were quite different.[116] But in the case of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the circumstances which they had to face were almost exactly analogous. The conflict between them, if the anti-Assyrian prophecies are genuine, would be a conflict in the fundamental conceptions of religion, unrelieved by differences in circumstances which might explain it. The fact is, Jeremiah's opposition to the doctrine of Zion's inviolability only serves to throw the disagreement between the anti-Assyrian prophecies and Isaiah's fundamental conceptions into still higher relief.

7) But not only Jeremiah was opposed to the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, Isaiah's own contemporary, Micah, was also opposed to it. And it is important to notice that this doctrine was a popular doctrine in Micah's and Isaiah's day exactly as it was in Jeremiah's.[117] Would Isaiah have been less true to his

[116] Into the vexed question of Jeremiah's general attitude toward Deuteronomy it is impossible to enter in this connection. There were certain elements in the deuteronomic reform with which Jeremiah might well have had some sympathy, but he was undoubtedly opposed to its fundamental idea, the centralization of the sanctuary at Zion, for he tells us this himself, or at least his biographer, Baruch, does, in a passage (c. 26) the substantial historicity of which is admitted even by the most sceptical of critics. Compare also c. 7, the essence of which must be regarded as genuine, even though, with Duhm, a considerable amount of redaction may be admitted. 11 1-14, on the other hand, must be regarded as wholly redactional (Duhm, Cornill, Puukko, *Jeremias Stellung zum Deuteronomium*, 1913). Erbt's ingenious attempt (*Jeremia und seine Zeit*) to save some of it for Jeremiah is quite unconvincing.

[117] "Jahweh is in our midst; evil shall not come nigh us" (Mi. 3 11 f.). "Let Jahweh, God of Hosts be with you as ye have said" (Amos 5 14). Both prophets put the same sentiment into the mouths of the people, but the context in Micah shows that it involves the belief in the inviolability of Zion. Immanuel at Is. 8 8b-10 expresses exactly the same thought.

great prophetic convictions than Micah was? Would he have made concessions at this point to popular fanaticism that Micah sturdily refused to make? The fact that Micah repudiated the doctrine of the inviolability of Zion should give us pause.[118]

V. The Place of the Anti-Assyrian and Messianic Prophecies in the Religion of Israel, and the Theory of the Revision.

But there are three objections which may be urged against the neo-critical attack upon the anti-Assyrian prophecies and which demand an answer. A brief consideration of them will also give opportunity to round out the neo-critical theory of this group.

a) It has often been held that the anti-Assyrian prophecies precede the deuteronomic reform and prepare the way for it, and hence are to be located in Isaiah's day. b) Again, if there was no glorious deliverance in 701, how is it possible to account for the rise of the legend found in the Isaiah narratives? c) Finally, if Isaiah's message was one of national disaster, how did it come to pass that the anti-Assyrian prophecies as well as the Messianic prophecies were attributed to him? Is not the supposition of a revision so totally alien to the original intent of Isaiah's message most unlikely?[119]

1) In the first place, granted that the anti-Assyrian prophecies might be regarded as precursers of the deuteronomic reform if their genuineness were once established, is it necessary to accept

[118] Robertson Smith and Smend felt this difficulty, but their attempts to solve it are most inadequate. Micah's attitude toward Jerusalem is supposed to be that of a provincial for whom the capital is a kind of Sodom. He would therefore contemplate the destruction of the city with more equanimity than Isaiah was able to do. The latter lived in the capital and had a more aristocratic turn of mind (Smith, p. 289 f.; Smend, p. 237, n. 2 f.). Smend also suggests that Micah may have anticipated the destruction of the city without at the same time anticipating the destruction of the nation. A difficult abstraction in the days of city-states, when the fall of the capital usually meant the destruction of the nation also!

[119] For this last objection compare, especially, Westphal, p. 176, and Miss Louise Smith, *The Messianic Ideal of Isaiah*, JBL 1917, p. 190.

their genuineness in order to account for that reform? By no means. A brief sketch of the development of the idea of a central sanctuary will make this plain.[120] Fortunately, the idea can be studied in the broad light of history, from its origin in the time of David and Solomon to its culminating expression in Deuteronomy. The origin of the doctrine is to be found in David's purchase of the threshing-floor of Araunah the Jebusite for the purpose of erecting an altar there, in order to commemorate the cessation of a plague which threatened the city in his day.[121] On this site Solomon later erected the temple. The temple was the royal sanctuary. The prestige acquired by the monarchy under David and Solomon accrued to the temple, and it speedily became the most famous sanctuary in the land, in spite of the fact that it was later in origin than many other holy places. Undoubtedly the priests who ministered at this royal shrine took advantage of the royal favor to elaborate a ceremonial corresponding in magnificence to the splendor of the court. After the Schism, two royal sanctuaries sprang up at Bethel and Dan, but this did not lower the prestige of the Jerusalem temple in the minds of the citizens of Judah. On the contrary, its supremacy was all the more insisted upon. When Judah became vassal to Israel and the monarchy suffered political eclipse, it was the temple alone that represented the ancient glory of the kingdom. It was in the temple that the national

[120] See especially, Well. *Proleg.*[3], pp. 18—26; Smend, *Die Bedeutung des Tempels*, (STK, 1884, p. 689 ff.); Westphal, *Jahwes Wohnstätten, passim.* These scholars all emphasize the great importance of Isaiah and of the events in 701 for the growth of the centralization idea. What follows suggests modifications of the general Wellhausen theory at these points.

[121] 2 Sam. 24. There is no good reason to doubt the substantial accuracy of the narrative in this chapter. (See especially Westphal, 161, and Budde's *Commentary on Samuel* ad loc.). This implies that the rock which fixed the site of the temple had not been a sanctuary in pre-Davidic times (See Kittel, *Studien zur Hebräischen Archaeologie*, I. Der Heilige Fels, for a different view). The sanctuary of the old Canaanite town was more probably at Gihon. It was there that the tent for the ark seems to have been pitched (1 Kings 1 32-40). Smith's doubt of the reason for the choice of the temple site assigned in 2 Sam. 24 seems to be unduly sceptical (see his *Commentary on Samuel* ad 2 Sam. 24).

pride could still find expression.[122] Further, Wellhausen rightly calls attention to a striking difference between the two Hebrew kingdoms which would greatly favor the temple. Whereas in Israel outstanding personalities were developed, in Judah institutions were developed.[123] The priesthood as well as the monarchy was far more stable in the southern kingdom than in the northern. The power of the priesthood at the capital and therefore the prestige of the temple would thus tend constantly to increase. When Israel finally succumbed to the first great rushes of Tiglath-Pileser IV, Shalmaneser V and Sargon, and Samaria fell in 722, whereas Judah escaped, the priests at the temple of Jerusalem would not have failed to point the lesson, and the unscathed temple at the Jewish capital must have still further gained in prestige. Hence, even before the events of 701 the temple must have come to exercise a great fascination upon the minds of Isaiah's contemporaries, and, as we see from the pages of Micah, the dogma of Zion's inviolability was already beginning to exercise its baleful influence. It is therefore entirely superfluous to call in the aid of the anti-Assyrian prophecies in order to understand the later development of the deuteronomic idea. The current which was setting in the direction of Deuteronomy was already running strong. But it was a current which ran in a very different channel from that in which Isaiah's thoughts were accustomed to flow. The waters of Siloah that flow softly could mingle scarcely more readily with this great popular flood of nationalism than they could with the waters of the Euphrates (Is. 8 5-8a). I do not mean to deny that Isaiah

[122] The immediate connection between the temple, as the *royal* sanctuary, and nationalism is obvious. It is still more obvious if the usual view of the ark may still be retained, which regards it as the most sacred cult object of Israel and connects it very closely with Jahweh as a war-god. The war-like and nationalistic associations which gathered around the ark would thus come to centre in the temple. The recent brilliant monograph of Arnold (*Ephod and Ark*, 1917) would modify the current conception of the importance of the ark very materially, if its conclusions were adopted. They have been subjected to a searching criticism by Budde (ZATW, 1921). It is, perhaps, too early to pronounce a final judgment upon them.

[123] *Geschichte*, p. 68.

was at times attracted by the temple. It was there he had his vision (c. 6) and it was there that Jahweh seemed to him to dwell (8 18). If one wishes to find a psychologically *natural* inconsistency in Isaiah, he can find it at this point.[124] But such an instinctive participation in the current modes of expressing a belief in the nearness of Jahweh is very different from sharing in the popular dogma of the temple's inviolability. As a matter of fact, Isaiah as distinctly repudiates that dogma in the Ariel prophecy as Micah himself does. The enigma of Ariel is only an enigma to those who are still dreaming in the older exegesis and criticism and who sadly need to be awaked. This prophecy in its present form in 29 1-8 illustrates, perhaps more clearly than any other single prophecy, how thoroughly nationalistic the anti-Assyrian prophecies are, and how flatly they contradict Isaiah's own convictions.[125]

[124] See above p. 39 f.

[125] It is unwise to begin the interpretation of 29 1-8 by attempting to determine the precise philological meaning of the very obscure term 'Ariel. It is better first to ascertain how it is used in this passage. The following points seem to be clear. 1) 'Ariel is evidently the name of a city. 2) The city can be no other than Jerusalem; at least it was understood to mean that by the writer of v. 8. 3) The name, and this is all important, *must be capable of a double meaning*, one suggesting honor and the other dishonor. The latter meaning is absolutely required by vs. 2, 3. In view of Jahweh's terrible dealing with her, 'Ariel shall be as 'Ariel! The former meaning is required by v. 1. Isaiah does not explain the name in this verse; it is therefore altogether probable that he uses a name or title of Jerusalem already familiar to the people. If so, it must have been used by them in an honorific and not in a derogatory sense. Thus the name which the people were accustomed to give to Jerusalem in reverence Isaiah gives to it as a threat. This conclusion seems to be absolutely necessary. It follows that no interpretation of 'Ariel which is unable to explain it in two opposite senses will meet the demands of the context. 4) But there is another antithesis in the passage which is often overlooked. וְחָנִיתִי, v. 2, is clearly used in a hostile sense. One reason why Jerusalem is likened to 'Ariel is because Jahweh is to encamp against it (עָלַיִךְ). But in what sense is חנה used in v. 1a? There is no defining word like עָלַיִךְ to tell us. It is commonly supposed to have a favorable sense in v. 1a e. g. to 'take up his abode'. This would agree with the meaning of 'Ariel in v. 1 and with the interpretation which the hearer would no doubt give when he heard the opening phrase of

2) But, it is usually said, the events of 701, as well as the anti-Assyrian prophecies, contributed very greatly to the strengthening of the tendency toward a centralization of the

the prophecy. The phrase is a reminder of the capture of the city by David, who thereupon made it his capital (2 Sam. 5 4-9). The auditor would understand Isaiah to be alluding to Jerusalem, which David made his capital and which is rightly called 'Ariel, a title of honor. But the phrase קריית חנה דוד is, like the name 'Ariel, capable of a double meaning The ellipsis suggested by the construction might be שם . . . אשר, "the city *where* David encamped", or it might be עליה . . . אשר, "the city *against which* David encamped", as the LXX actually understands it (ἣν ἐπολέμησεν). The question at once arises whether the phrase in v. 1 is not purposely ambiguous, exactly as the title, 'Ariel, is ambiguous. But in that case, since Isaiah makes it clear that he intends to use 'Ariel in an unfavorable sense in v. 2, it is probable that at v. 3 he intends to use חנה in its unfavorable sense. Accordingly, the two phrases are to be brought into the same sort of antithesis as the two uses of the name 'Ariel. This can be done very effectively and at the same time the impossible כדוד of the M.T. be eliminated by reading with the LXX "as David". The people think of Jerusalem as 'Ariel, in the favorable sense of that term; Isaiah thinks of it in the unfavorable sense of the term. The people think of it as the city where David encamped, i. e. made it his capital; Isaiah thinks of it as the city against which David once fought. There is nothing intrinsically inviolable about Jerusalem. David once fought against it and captured it; Jahweh can do the same. The subtle but stinging irony of the passage on this interpretation is parallelled almost exactly by 28 21, where Isaiah uses another historical allusion with which pleasant associations were attached in the popular mind in an exactly opposite sense; and compare, also, what I believe to be his ironical use of Immanuel at 7 14. Thus the passage can be very well understood even though the exact nature of the play on 'Ariel eludes us. The two interpretations of the word most current in recent years which do most justice to the demand of the context that it should be capable of a double meaning are 'altar' or 'altar-hearth', and 'mountain of the world' and 'underworld'. The latter meaning is based on the Babylonian *'aral(l)u*. The former is the usual Jewish interpretation and has been given special currency by Duhm. The latter was suggested by Jeremias (ATAO^2 p. 558), was tentatively adopted by Staerk, p. 206, and has recently been championed by Feigin and Albright (JBL 1920, 131ff., 137ff.). Either view suggests a very forcible play on the name. If "altar-hearth" is adopted, the contrast is between the popular conception of the altar, as symbolic of all that is sacred and inviolable, and the prophet's very unconventional conception of it, as a place of blood and fire, where the victims are slaughtered or burned. Jerusalem, which is Jahweh's sacred altar in the popular view,

cult at Jerusalem. If there was no such signal deliverance at this time, we lose the benefit, it is claimed, of one of the most interesting historical events out of which the growth of the deuteronomic idea could be explained. And again the question presses: How can the legend of such a deliverance have grown up if there was no historical fact to which it could attach? But we have seen that the tendency toward centralization was already in existence, and therefore a signal deliverance in 701 was no more *necessary* to account for the culmination of the tendency in the deuteronomic reform of Josiah's day than were the anti-Assyrian prophecies. Nevertheless, the events of 701 probably *did* stimulate this tendency, though in a somewhat different way than has been commonly supposed. If the views of the Isaiah

will become a shambles, dripping with the blood of its own citizens. It is interesting to realize that Calvin already suggested this interpretation. If the view of Jeremias is adopted, then Isaiah says that Jerusalem, the sacred mountain, will become a Hades where only shades live their ghostly life (cf. v. 4). The significance of the passage is the same on either view. In favor of the former, however, is the fact that Ezekiel actually uses 'Ariel in the sense of 'altar-hearth', and also the fact that Isaiah had little respect for the ceremonial (cf. 1 10ff.). Professor Clay explains 'Ariel as meaning "Uru is God", with reference to the original chief deity of Jerusalem. This name we are told "was *appropriately* substituted by Isaiah for the name Jerusalem in his address to the city, which, doubtless, had continued to worship that god" (Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society I, p. 32). But what is the exegetical significance of the adverb "appropriately"? Not only 'Ariel in v. 1, but 'Ariel in v. 2 must be explained. Now the point of this discussion for our purposes is this. However 'Ariel is explained, it is clear that Isaiah is playing upon it and using it in v. 2 *in a totally different sense from the popular use of it in v. 1.* But in vs. 5-8 'Ariel is undoubtedly used in the popular sense. Mount Zion as 'Ariel is sacrosanct and inviolable. Those who wage war against her will be scattered as a dream, a rather adventurous suggestion in view of the fact that Jahweh himself is to encamp against her according to v. 3. A denial of the real thought intended in vs. 1-4 could not be more expressly formulated than is done in vs. 5-8. The popular conception of the inviolability of the sacred city which Isaiah repudiates in vs. 1-4 is reasserted in vs. 5-8. The astonishment at v. 9f. is not occasioned by the "enigma" of 'Ariel's sudden glorious deliverance out of its deep humiliation (cf. Delitzsch), but by the fact that this supposedly sacrosanct city is to be the scene of pillage and massacre. Strange and outlandish is Jahweh's work (28 21)!

narratives presented above are adopted, there was no deliverance which would seem *at the time* to be any justification of the unqualified promises in the anti-Assyrian prophecies. What contemporaries of the events must have thought can be gathered from c. 1, where Jerusalem is described as "a tent in a vineyard, a shack in a cucumber-patch". Isaiah evidently assumes that his hearers will realize the melancholy character of the situation as vividly as he does himself. But *with the lapse of time* a very different theory might grow up about what happened in 701. As a matter of fact Jerusalem was not sacked; the temple still stood. Sennacherib is as clear on this subject as the Bible itself. What seemed to Isaiah's contemporaries to be a complete vindication of the prophet's predictions of disaster could easily take on a very different aspect in the eyes of a later generation. The doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, in the confidence in which the nationalist party had revolted against Assyria, no doubt received a rude shock when, at the time of the invasion, Hezekiah had to strip the temple doors in order to pay his indemnity (2 K. 18 13–16). But as the memory of the bitter desolation gradually faded out, as such memories almost always do fade out, the fact that the capital and the temple were saved began to assume greater and greater importance. How was it possible for Jerusalem to escape the fate that overtook so many of its sister cities? Jahweh's hand must have signally intervened to deliver it. If so, he must have especially chosen Zion to place his name there. The countryside had been devastated. Its altars had been desecrated. Jerusalem alone must be the place to worship Jahweh in; Jerusalem alone is inviolable. Surely there is no difficulty in accounting both for the development of the deuteronomic legend in the Isaiah narratives and the strengthening of the deuteronomic doctrine on the basis of the actual facts in 701 after "the unimaginable touch of time" had begun to soften their original asperities.[126] As time went on doctrine and legend

[126] The above argument is an expansion of hints by Meinhold (*Jesajaerzählung*, p. 103). Retrospective judgments upon the significance of Sennacherib's invasion and contemporary judgments upon it by those who experienced its horrors could be very different. It is this distinction between contemporary and subsequent impressions upon which I would

supported each other, and when it is remembered that it was to the various interests of both priests and prophets at the time of Josiah's reform to cultivate the one and confirm the other, it is not surprising to find them blossoming and burgeoning ever more luxuriantly.[127] The anti-Assyrian prophecies are not the precursors of this development but the reflections of it. But how did these prophecies, along with the Messianic prophecies, become attributed to the man whose ideas are so diametrically opposed to them? In order to answer this question it is necessary to trace the development beyond the time of Deuteronomy.

3) If the suggestions thus far made have been approximately true, it will, by this time, be realized that the doctrines of the Messianic king and of the inviolability of Zion, which have been the special subjects of our study, are closely allied with nationalism. But in the deuteronomic reform the ecclesiastical theory of the state began to encroach upon the political theory of it. It is interesting to observe that the law for the king in Deuteronomy (17 14–20), even if its originality is admitted, does not emphasize the political duties of the office.[128] The downfall of

lay special emphasis. Some of the concrete details in the Isaiah narratives, certainly the mention of Tirhaka, and possibly the plague, are confusions with later events. The recent excavations of Reisner at Napata (Harvard Theological Rev. Jan. 1920) show how increasingly difficult it is to suppose that Tirhaka could have been called king of Cush in 701. The plague may have been a confused reminiscence of what seems to have been a failure of Esarhaddon in the Egyptian campaign of 675 (673?). See Winckler, KAT 88. Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels*, p. 351 for this defect. It is a pity, however, that Reisner revives Winckler's mythical kingdom of Musri. It was to be hoped that Meyer's and Olmstead's attack had forever put to flight the forces of that shadow realm (see Meyer, *Israel und seine Nachbarstämme*, p. 459 ff., and Olmstead, *Sargon of Assyria*, p. 56—71). So far as Reisner argues against the credibility of the Isaiah narratives on the basis of Winckler's speculations, his argument must be discounted, but apart from this he shows how unlikely it was for Tirhaka to take the position in 701 ascribed to him in the Isaiah narratives.

127 Is it fanciful to think that the deuteronomic reformers may have utilized the legend to carry through their reforms, which no doubt met with a considerable resistance on the part of the conservative peasantry?

128 Cf., especially, Boehmer, *Der alttestamentliche Unterbau des Reiches Gottes*, pp. 65—67. The law is quite generally regarded as a later addition (e. g. by Wellhausen, Cornill, Steuernagel, Puukko).

the dynasty and the temple in 586 might have proved equally disastrous to both institutions, but as a matter of fact it was not. The temple stood the test of the disaster better than the monarchy. The great theocratical development which now set in, stimulated as it was by the exigencies of the political situation, worked to the advantage of the former rather than of the latter. Ezekiel's hopes centre in a restored temple rather than in a restored monarchy, though hopes of the latter are not altogether wanting.[129] In Ezekiel 37 24–28, for the first time in our documents, temple and monarchy are brought together in the picture of the glorious future.[130] The two kingdoms are to be united, indeed, under one head; David, probably an individual rather than the dynasty, shall be their prince or king (v. 24, 25). But the culminating feature in the eschatological landscape is the temple, not the palace: "The nations shall know that I am Jahweh that sanctifieth Israel when my sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore" (v. 28). It was this vision of Ezekiel, in which monarchy and temple are combined, which seems to have moulded the hopes of the leaders of the returning exiles some seventy years later. At the return under Zerubbabel we have the one distinct attempt of prechristian times to realize the Messianic royal ideal. It is therefore very interesting to see how closely Haggai and Zechariah associated the Messiahship of Zerubbabel with the temple. It is the completion of the temple that is to usher in the Messianic kingdom.

Now the most remarkable characteristic of this movement, at least in its inception, is its idealistic *abandon*. Haggai and Zechariah are not (consciously at least) political intriguers. They eschew all political means to accomplish their ends. "Not by might, nor by power but by my spirit, saith Jahweh of Hosts" (Zech. 4 6) – that was their slogan. The people were not even

[129] Cf. 34 23-24; 37 22-23, 24-27. Aytoun has recently suggested the elimination of these prophecies as spurious (JBL., 1920, p. 35, n. 30); but see Begrich (ZWT, 1904, pp. 433 ff.), and Herrmann (*Ezechielstudien*, pp. 124—126) for their relation to Ezekiel's hopes of the future, on the more probable supposition of their genuineness.

[130] In the later passage, Jer. 30 21, the אדיר and the משל seem to have much the same position as Ezekiel's נשיא in cc. 40—48.

to begin with building the walls of Jerusalem; Jahweh himself would be a wall of fire (Zech. 2 9). The only thing the people were to do in order to insure the great Messianic epiphany was to build the temple; Jahweh would see to the rest. He would shake the nations, the Persian empire would fall, and the temple would be glorified (Haggai c. 2). It is a singular mixture of realism and idealism, of the historical and the miraculous, that we have in these prophecies. The hopes attach to an historical character, Zerubbabel, and to the historical foundation of the temple, but they are incapable of historical realization in any literal sense. Do we not see in this episode actually unfolding before our eyes the dissociation of history and eschatology to which Wellhausen refers as so characteristic of the post-exilic forms of prophecy? Is it not out of such a time, or at least out of the ideas and hopes which controlled this period that prophecies like cc. 9 and 11 can be most satisfactorily explained? In these prophecies, as in the visions of Haggai and Zechariah, the supernatural is prominent, though attached to history through the Davidic dynasty. The insistence upon peace as one of the prime characteristics of the Messiah's reign, the lack of emphasis upon any warlike activities, are in exact agreement with the idealism of Haggai and Zechariah.[131] The nationalism in the figure of the Messiah has been sublimated by the close association of the Messiah with the temple. Those elements in Is. cc. 9 and 11 which have been held to express Isaiah's revolt against nationalism and have therefore served as a basis for the defense of these prophecies,[132] are far more easily explained, not as an antithesis to the nationalism of Isaiah's day, but as the natural expression of the new conception of nationalism in the post-exilic period, in which the nation is no longer, strictly speaking, the nation, but is rather a nascent church, and the king is a servant of the temple. Duhm himself has pointed out the close affinity of Is. 2 2–4 (5) with the Messianic prophecies in cc. 9 and 11. It is by no means an improbable supposition that the three poems are by the same author, even if he is not Isaiah. In that case

[131] Hag. 2 9; Zech. 8 12 (read: "I will sow peace", and cf. LXX).
[132] See Caspari, *Echtheit der Messianischen Weissagung*, Is. 9 1-6.

we have exactly the same association of temple and Messiah in these three prophecies as we have in the prophecies of Ezekiel, Haggai and Zechariah.[133] As for the anti-Assyrian prophecies, those which have been denied to Isaiah, even by the more cautious critics, have been usually referred to the Greek period, on the supposition that Assyria refers to the Seleucid kingdom. But it is by no means impossible that some of these may come

[133] The above paragraph suggests, very tentatively, the association of Is. 2 2-5, 9 1-6 and 11 1-9 with the ideas of Haggai and Zechariah. This is the date to which they are assigned by Sellin in his *Serubbabel* (not accessible to me) and his *Studien* (II, p. 172ff.), and by Marti, and very cautiously by Gray, with variations as to the more precise time. (Sellin, whose agile mind is as sensitive to new impressions as Lloyd George's, has since accepted once more the genuineness of these prophecies, under the influence of the Gunkel-Gressmann methods. See his *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 71, and *Der alttestamentliche Prophetismus*, p. 150, and *passim*). Hackmann, Cheyne, and Volz do not seek to date the prophecies with any exactness. They refer them, generally, to the post-exilic period. Stade (*Geschichte*, II, p. 209) seems to assign them to the period between Nehemiah and Alexander the Great. Kennett (Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. VII, p. 321 ff., and *Composition of the Book of Isaiah*, p. 85) assigns these prophecies to the Maccabean period. Similarly Aytoun (JBL, 1920, p. 40 ff.). The same objection might be urged against a date in the early post-exilic period that has been urged against the Isaianic origin of these prophecies: Should we not expect some reference to them in the later literature (see Gray, *Commentary*, p. 166)? There seems to be such a reference at Is. 65 25 (cf. Is. 11 7, 9). But the meagreness of allusions to them must be admitted. However, this can be better accounted for on the supposition that they came out of the time of Haggai and Zechariah than if they were written by Isaiah. In the former case they were anonymous prophecies and would presumably not have the weight that they would have in the latter case (Hackmann, p. 156). But far more important than this consideration is the fact that, if these prophecies are associated with the Messianic movement in the time of Zerubbabel, they are associated with a movement which ended in a fiasco. At that time it is quite clear that the Messianic hopes received a blow from which they did not soon recover. Oracles which encouraged these hopes would naturally lose influence when the hopes were disappointed. But into a detailed discussion of the real date of these prophecies it is not necessary for my purpose to go. All I am concerned to do is to show that they can be better understood out of the political situation and theological convictions of a later age than they can out of Isaiah's day.

out of the pre-exilic period and refer to the Assyrian empire itself. Nahum is not likely to have been the only nationalist prophet to cherish a fierce hatred of Assyria. Beer has suggested that 10 5–19 came out of the time of Nahum and Zephaniah.[134] If the views advanced above are accepted, the original part of this prophecy is by Isaiah himself, but a renewed consideration of a date before the fall of Nineveh for some of the anti-Assyrian prophecies is desirable.

When we turn to examine the Book of Isaiah in the light of the development just sketched out, we can, for the first time, fully understand the significance of its peculiar structure. Under the changed conditions of the post-exilic period the original threats of eighth-century prophecy have become surrounded with a great framework of eschatological hope. How long it was in preparing, whether any materials for it were furnished by pre-exilic sources, these are questions of detail which do not immediately concern our problem. The one thing needful is to realize that there was such a revision. It is the great merit of Duhm to have concentrated upon the fact and the importance of this revision for the proper understanding of Isaiah. With the assumption of such a revision we have at last arrived at the place where it is in order to attempt an answer to the third objection to the critical view urged above. How is it possible to suppose that the two great groups of hope prophecies became attributed by the redactors to a man whose fundamental convictions they so flatly contradicted?

a) In the first place, Isaiah was the most out-standing figure in eighth-century prophecy. Moreover, this greatest of all the early prophets was a citizen of Judah. What a deep impression the fulfilment of the warnings of these pre-exilic prophets made upon the post-exilic Jewish community is revealed in the very instructive passage Zech. 7 7–14.[135] But did the significance of the message of such a man apply only to pre-exilic times? This would hardly seem credible to those of a later day. But after the exile threats were no longer in order. There must have

[134] *Wellhausen-Festschrift*, pp. 15—35.

[135] Delete v. 8, with Well., Marti, and Mitchell; perhaps also v. 9a (Marti).

been a message of hope also in the great prophets, adapted to the needs of the returned exiles. Thus there would be the strongest dogmatic interest in the attempt to make Isaiah, the greatest of the pre-exilic prophets of Judah, serviceable to the needs of post-exilic Judaism.

b) Again, there are admittedly genuine hopes in Isaiah (1 21–26, the doctrine of the Remnant, and the doctrine of faith), to which the dogmatic eschatology of the later times might conceivably attach itself. When the post-exilic community identified itself with the Remnant,[136] it would be very natural for them to read back *their* ideas of the Remnant into Isaiah's, though Isaiah meant something quite different. They could even make capital out of Isaiah's doctrine of the Day of the Lord. That, too, became popularized again in later times, and was construed as implying hope for the Jews. Since it is unquestionably one of Isaiah's doctrines, it would not be a difficult task for post-exilic revisers, who were without an historical sense but were controlled by a very strong theological bias, to construe it in a sense favorable to themselves, just as Christians of the present day often read back their own ideas into New Testament passages which originally meant something quite different from what they suppose. Thus there are a number of genuine passages in Isaiah which later could be utilized as starting-points for a dogmatic revision. But much more important than these considerations are three other special facts which will account for the incorporation of the two groups of prophecies under discussion into a collection of Isaiah's prophecies.

c) We have seen how there gradually grew up a very different judgment upon the events of 701 from the judgment of contemporaries. The bare escape of capital and temple from massacre and pillage became construed as a signal deliverance, wrought by Jahweh, himself. But Isaiah was the outstanding figure at that time. Was it possible for a prophet not to be aware of Jahweh's intentions to save the city, and, being aware of them, was it possible for him to keep silent?[137] Once grant

[136] Hag. 1 12, 14; 2 2; Zech. 8 6, 11, 12.

[137] Cf. Amos 3 7, 8.

the development of the legend of deliverance, and it is an easy step to associate Isaiah with that deliverance and to suppose that he must have defied Assyria.

d) This last conclusion would be confirmed by a very natural misunderstanding of one of his most striking prophecies. If our view of the original meaning of 10 5–15 is correct, Isaiah did defy Assyria and threaten its final overthrow, though he did not draw any inferences from this as to the deliverance of Judah. But it was certainly a very natural inference that he must have done so. The revision of c. 10, which brought it into harmony with the legend of the Isaiah narratives and the dogma of the inviolability of Zion, was a most natural revision to make, and this could furnish the starting-point for the gradual incorporation of the remaining anti-Assyrian prophecies into the original collections.

e) A similar very natural misunderstanding probably led to the incorporation of the Messianic prophecies. In 7 14 Isaiah predicted the birth of a child who should be given the name Immanuel. The name sounded to the ear full of promise. It was the most natural thing in the world for later students of the old texts to interpret it in an altogether favorable sense and even to see in it a reference to the Messiah. The later Messianic interpretation seems clear at 8 8b–10. But granted the originally independent existence of 9 1–6, where again the birth of a child of Messianic significance was prophesied, it was almost inevitable that the two children should be identified, and 9 1–6 be incorporated into the collection of Isaiah's prophecies in order to confirm the interpretation of 7 14; 9 1–6 would, of course, carry along with it its companion piece, 11 1–9. Thus the presence of the two great groups of the Messianic and anti-Assyrian prophecies among Isaiah's oracles can be very readily accounted for as due (1) to the very strong dogmatic desire of the post-exilic Jewish community to interpret the great Jewish prophet in a way serviceable to the later religious needs, and (2) to the ease with which many genuine elements of Isaiah's prophecies could be misunderstood by commentators who were indifferent to historical investigations.

It is not claimed that the revision must have worked exactly

along the lines just indicated. But it is claimed that it could have done so. The drastic nature of the revision, if both the great groups of prophecies under discussion are eliminated, is admitted. But I have tried to show that there is nothing either incredible or even unlikely about it. The theory of Isaiah, the book, here advanced results in the ethical and spiritual interpretation of Isaiah, the man, which Wellhausen, Smend and Robertson Smith advocated, as opposed to the supernaturalistic and apocalyptic interpretation of Duhm. But this interpretation is arrived at, not by means of an improbable exegesis of the oracles in question, but by their critical elimination. Wellhausen's theory of Isaiah, the man, was correct; but his exegesis of the Messianic and anti-Assyrian prophecies was wrong. Duhm's exegesis of these oracles is more nearly correct than Wellhausen's, but his criticism is in unstable equilibrium, and this leads him to a false estimation of Isaiah, the man. Neither scholar should take it amiss if his principles have been carried out a step farther than he himself was willing to go. That is usually the fortune of men of original ideas. They are unable to check the momentum of their own creative thoughts. The work initiated by Wellhausen, Duhm, and Stade has thus logically culminated first, in the relegation of the Messianic and anti-Assyrian prophecies to a later date, secondly, in a theory of Isaiah, the man, which emphasizes as no other theory does what is permanently valuable in his message, and thirdly, in the only theory of Isaiah, the book, which does any sort of justice to its peculiar nature. These are great accomplishments. Are they to be repudiated as artificial schematization, as an illegitimate attempt to modernize Isaiah? A formidable attack has been made in recent years upon the whole development of the neo-critical school, and before it is possible to rest at ease in its interpretation of Isaiah, it will be necessary to examine with some care this attack.

Table, illustrative of the Revision of cc. 1—39.

I

Chaps. 1—12.

C. 1	Judgment	cancelled	by	2 2–4 (5)	Eschatological	hope	
2 6—4 1	„	„	„	4 2–6	„	„
5 1–29	„	„	„	5 30	„	„
6 1—8 18 (19–22)	„	„	„	9 1–6 (see 8 8b–10)	„	„
9 7—10 4	„	„	„	10 5—12 6	„	„

or

C. 1—9 as a whole culminating in cc. 10—12 „ „

II

Chaps. 13—27.

Cc. 13—23 Judgments on the several nations, culminating in cc. 24—27, the Eschatological world-judgment.

Note. 17 1–11 cancelled by 17 12–14, and compare 17 12–14 with 8 8b–10 and 29 5–8.

III

Chaps. 28—35.

28 1–4	Judgment	cancelled	by	28 5, 6	Eschatological	hope	
28 7–22	„	„	„	28 23–29	„	„
29 1–4	„	„	„	29 5–8	„	„
29 9–15	„	„	„	29 16–24	„	„
30 1–17	„	„	„	30 18–26, 27–33	„	„
31 1–4	„	„	„	31 5–9	„	„

Cc. 28—31 as a whole culminating in { cc. 32, 33 Append I / cc. 34, 35 Append II

IV

Chaps. 36—39.

Historical Narratives.

PART II

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL SCHOOL

The Attempt to rehabilitate the Doctrines of the Messiah and the Inviolability of Zion as authentic Elements in Isaiah's Teaching, and the renewed Emphasis upon the Supernaturalistic in Terms of the Mythological.

I. Principles and Methods. Gunkel.

If the attempt is made to sum up the chief characteristics of the neo-critical hypothesis so far as its results and its methods of arriving at them are concerned they are the following:

1) The present book of Isaiah is a prophetic anthology in the compilation of which Isaiah himself had little share. 2) The evidence for this is found, at the outset, in two main groups of phenomena: a) in the presence of certain prophecies in cc. 1—39 (the Babylonian) which cannot have been composed by Isaiah because of their historical backgrounds; and b) in the peculiar nature of the transitions between the prophecies of threat and consolation. These are not of the character that Isaiah himself would have been likely to make. Isaiah was a creative genius and a master stylist. He had full power to express his thoughts in the way he saw fit, whereas the transitions are artificial and suggest the hand of one who was working over material furnished by tradition. Moreover, in the most of these transitions a distinct tendency is observable, namely, to supply to the prophecies of woe consolatory additions. This purpose cannot be attributed to the prophet himself, for it results in a conscious cancellation of the threats by the hopes. 3) But it is conceivable that, while the present sequence of the oracles is not due to Isaiah, the consolatory passages themselves, or at least the greater part of them, may still be genuine. It may be conjectured that the hopes and the threats were spoken under different circumstances and were only at a later time brought together in their present singular sequences. The next step is, therefore, to examine each of the prophecies with respect to its genuineness. Again two lines of investigation are open, the literary and the historical.

a) The literary investigation involves an examination of the style and vocabulary of the disputed prophecies. In what has preceded, this argument has hardly been touched upon. This is because the argument, though yielding excellent results in the case of some of the prophecies (e. g. c. 4 or 29 16–24), is of much less certain application in the case of the more important ones. b) The historical investigation involves an examination of the historical background of the hope prophecies, and when that fails, as it usually does, *an examination of their ideas.* Could their ideas be understood in the age of Isaiah and were they likely to be entertained by him? 4) At first glance it might seem as if the task were a hopeless one. The danger of the vicious circle is obvious. Fortunately, however, there is a considerable body of material as to the genuineness of which there is universal agreement. This material is marked by a uniform style of the greatest originality and power. In subject matter it agrees with the commission given to the prophet in his inaugural vision to announce destruction to his nation. It also corresponds to the known political and religious situation in Isaiah's times. In its political aspects this material regularly urges a policy of non-interference in world-politics. Religiously and ethically it castigates without mercy the sins and excesses in the national life. In view of the political antagonism to the prophet on the part of the king and people, reflected in this material and corroborated by the Assyrian inscriptions, which show that Judah inclined to follow a political policy the reverse of that advocated by Isaiah, and in view of the religious antagonism reflected in the same material with equal clearness, Isaiah's anticipations of destruction are readily understood. Not so easy to understand are the groups of prophecies which deal with the Messianic King and the Inviolability of Zion. When judged by the admittedly genuine prophecies these prophecies come under the gravest suspicion. They are found to be out of harmony with Isaiah's most characteristic thoughts and deepest convictions and at the same time with the needs of the political and religious situation in his day as he understood it. 5) But in proportion as they are out of touch with Isaiah's own modes of thinking, they are in agreement with the hopes which prophecy cherished

from the time of Ezekiel on. It is the prophecies of Ezekiel which form the great watershed between the pre-exilic and the post-exilic canonical eschatology.[138] The prophecies of eschatological hope in cc. 1—39 are in general accord with the ideas of Ezekiel and his successors. 6) It is this observation which has led to the neo-critical conclusion that the original Isaianic material has been surrounded by a great frame-work of eschatology which was constructed in the post-exilic period.

In the mode of arriving at this conclusion three things are especially noteworthy. a) The neo-critical school operates chiefly with *the criterion of ideas*. If an idea is alien to Isaiah, it is concluded to be spurious and *therefore later*. b) But in operating with the criterion of ideas, the neo-critical school is operating in the sphere of psychology; its criticism may be called a *psychologizing criticism*. It seeks to explain the genesis of ideas, just so far as it can, out of known historical situations. Or when it pronounces an idea to be alien to Isaiah, this is also a *psychologizing judgment*; the idea cannot be understood in the light of Isaiah's other ideas or his mission to his generation. c) In the third place, the neo-critical school is primarily a school of literary, or, more precisely, documentary criticism. By this is meant that it has sought to explain the development of the religion of Israel out of the Old Testament itself. It has first attempted to disentangle the various documents now found in the Old Testament and then has attempted to date them. Next, it too often makes the assumption that the dates of the first literary expression of ideas are largely determined by the dates

[138] The substantial genuineness of Ezekiel is here assumed, in common with the great majority of scholars, and also the propriety of the distinction of pre-exilic and post-exilic. The attack made upon this distinction in Professor Torrey's brilliant *Ezra Studies* (cf. p. 289 especially) seems to me to be exposed to practically insurmountable difficulties. It certainly cannot be carried through so long as the substantial genuineness of Ezekiel is admitted. It is therefore very interesting to discover in a modest little foot-note, (p. 288, n. 8, cf. also his *Notes on the Aramaic Part of Daniel*, in Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, Vol. XV, p. 248, n. 1) that Ezekiel is relegated to the Greek period! Until that foot-note is established by a completely wrought-out argument, one may be permitted at this point in Judah's history still to travel in the beaten paths.

of the documents in which they occur. Thus the history of the religion of Israel has been very largely constructed on the theory that the relative position of an idea in the religious development is to be determined by the time of its first certain appearance in the literature. Again, and this is all-important, the place where an idea is supposed to appear for the first time with certainty is where it is found in a self-explanatory passage, where it is expressed in a distinct and intelligible fashion and is in some sort of an organic connection with its context. (Note the psychologizing interest at this point.) On the other hand, in case an idea happens to occur in two passages, if in one of them it is expressed intelligibly and in organic connection with its context and in the other only allusively and in a way that cannot be fully understood, the second passage is commonly held to be secondary to the first. If the allusive passage happens to be attributed to an author earlier than the time of the clear passage, then the inclination is to deny the authenticity of the allusive passage. We have seen how the anti-Assyrian passages in Isaiah were gradually weeded out because it was difficult to explain them out of Isaiah's life-time, but easy to explain them out of Ezekiel's.[139]

This method of utilizing the criterion of ideas has played a large part in the views of the Old Testament commonly accepted at the present time. And there is a good reason for this. In all historical study the documentary evidence, provided it exists at all, must be the controlling evidence. It is the first duty of the historian to register the phenomena of his documents and to start from these in any attempted reconstruction. Yet there are two other factors which must be reckoned with in estimating the value of the criterion of ideas. In the first place, an idea may be unintelligible or seemingly allusive because it is inchoate. When is an idea unintelligible because it is inchoate and when is it unintelligible because it is allusive? To decide this question is not always easy. In the second place, the school of criticism which uses this criterion most freely also admits that the documents we now have in the Old Testament represent only the

[139] Cf. Stade's formulation of this principle above, p. 20 f., and n. 42.

wrecks of pre-exilic literature. But when this is recognized, the method of argument just described becomes at times somewhat precarious.[140] Of two passages in which the same idea occurs, will the allusive passage always be subsequent to the self-explanatory, and in case the allusive passage is ascribed to an earlier writer, must its genuineness necessarily be denied? May not both the allusive and the self-explanatory passage alike depend, at times, upon some primitive tradition, either written or oral, but now lost? In that case the origin of an idea may be, hypothetically, much earlier than the time of its first appearance in a given document. Late documents may now be likened to fossil beds; the literary strata may be very late, but many ancient ideas may be found in them.[141] The criticism which thus seeks to get back of the documentary evidence in its investigation of the development of ideas may be called, for want of a better name, the archaeological school of criticism as distinct from the documentary.[142] Yet at one point the schools are in striking agreement. Both start from the assumption, usually a correct one, that a passage in which an idea is only allusively or obscurely referred to is secondary. The difference between them lies in this, that, whereas the literary school tries to show that the allusive passage is secondary to some known document in which the idea is more clearly developed, the archaeological school raises the question whether both passages may not at times be secondary to a still earlier and undocumented tradition. The result of the application of this suggestion to the study of the religion of Israel in general or to Isaiah in particular may easily become revolutionary. For example, the neo-critical school argued that because an idea was alien to Isaiah, therefore it was spurious and *therefore later,* but the archaeological school argues that, if an idea is alien to Isaiah, therefore it *may* be earlier. But if earlier, it is quite conceiv-

140 To take an illustration out of another field, an analysis of the development of the doctrine of the Trinity should not place too much weight on the fact, even though it is a very interesting one, that the word *trinitas* first occurs, so far as we know, in Tertullian (*Ad Prax.*, c. 2).

141 Compare the "Priests Code".

142 See above, n. 3.

able that in spite of its alien character Isaiah may have borrowed it. The archaeological school thus seeks to develop the strategy of a flanking movement against the attack of the neo-critical forces.

But this is by no means all of it. Has anything really been gained, it might be asked, for the defense of the disputed passages in Isaiah? Is not the idea in question *still* alien and can it, therefore, even yet be admitted to be genuine? At this point the second main feature in archaeological criticism comes to view. It scorns the psychologizing of the neo-critical school. If it can only be once established that a given idea is older than Isaiah but is now found in Isaiah's prophecies, its genuineness cannot be rejected just because it happens to be out of touch with Isaiah's thinking. By the time it gets to Isaiah the idea may have lost its original meaning and become simply a convention and Isaiah may have used it without being aware of its real conflict with his views. Luther undoubtedly carried a large amount of Roman Catholic ballast over into Protestantism without being aware of its inner disagreement with his own fundamental conceptions. Why may not Isaiah have done the same? Thus the attempts of the neo-critics always to relate a given idea in Isaiah to his other ideas, and, if this cannot be done, to declare it to be spurious is, it is claimed, an illegitimate attempt at psychologizing. But how can it be proved that a given idea is earlier than Isaiah, or the eighth-century prophets? In certain cases, it is maintained, by a very easy method. If the idea is *mythical*, it is primitive and therefore pre-prophetic. At this point the archaeological school advances beyond the limits of the Old Testament into the field of comparative religions in order to point out analogies and show the essentially mythical character of certain ideas that had never before been suspected. Thus, over against the neo-critical insistence a) upon the criterion of ideas, b) upon their documentation within the Old Testament canon, and c) upon psychological considerations in the endeavor to relate them to each other, the archaeologists lay the emphasis a) upon the great body of undocumented tradition of which there are many hints in the documents themselves, b) upon the larger background of ancient oriental thought

outside the canonical scriptures, and c) upon the mythological character of much of this tradition and thought. In a word, where the neo-critic insists upon psychology, the archaeological critic is apt to insist upon mythology. Now the danger in archaeological criticism is even more apparent than in literary criticism. As soon as the historian leaves his documents, he embarks on the uncharted sea of conjecture. Still, that is what Columbus did, and he discovered a continent. It remains to be seen whether the archaeological critic will be as successful.

Gunkel may fairly be called the founder of the archaeological school. He was very happy in his choice of a field in which to try out the new method. "In his *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* (1895) he proved that in many passages in the Bible, and particularly in the first chapters of Genesis, there are borrowings, reminiscences, and allusions which can be traced to the Babylonian Cosmogonic Poems. The method he pursued was to take many phrases, words, and ideas in the Bible, and show that by themselves they were unintelligible; to be understood they must be set in a larger context. The Babylonian creation epic furnishes this context. In the application of the method it appeared that many ideas which are now found only in late portions of the Bible and which, for this reason, were supposed to be themselves late, had a long antecedent history in Hebrew literature and tradition. Gunkel himself suggested that the same method should be applied to the subject of Hebrew eschatology generally, and in (Bousset und Gunkel) *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, Heft I (1903) he sketched out a history of the eschatological idea of the Day of the Lord on the basis of this new method of research. But it remained for Gressmann in his *Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie* (1906) to subject for the first time the whole problem of Old Testament eschatology to a reexamination in the light of Gunkel's new method".[143] But at the outset it should be observed that in dealing with the ἔσχατα Gressmann is at a decided disadvantage as compared with Gunkel who dealt with the πρῶτα. Gunkel had actual

[143] See for the above paragraph the authors article in the Harvard Theological Review, Oct. 1913, p. 504.

documents to fall back on, even if they were not biblical documents. The Babylonian accounts of creation were in existence. But there is no epic of the end of the world. There is no eschatological myth as there is a creation myth, at least there is none such that is clearly recognizable. The application of the new method to eschatology is therefore beset with far more pitfalls than was its application to the creation myth.

Now it is from the point of view of archaeological criticism that Gunkel and, especially, Gressmann attempt to defend the genuineness of those prophecies in Isaiah which the neo-critical school have so vigorously assailed. Into an examination of the various conjectures of these scholars, often brilliant, sometimes convincing, it is impossible to enter. It is enough to note that in the following four particulars which immediately concern us they have either proved their case or at least the benefit of the doubt may be allowed them. 1) They have proved with certainty that the doctrine of the Day of the Lord existed before Amos in a popular form. It was a day in which Jahweh was to deliver his people. The prophets moralized this popular nationalist doctrine and turned the day of deliverance into one of destruction because of the people's sins.[144] 2) They have made probable the pre-prophetic[145] existence of the doctrine of the Remnant, also in a popular form in which Israel was the Remnant. This, of course, depends upon the genuineness and interpretation of Amos 5 15. The genuineness of this verse is not undisputed, yet usually accepted, as for example by even so radical a critic as Marti. Its interpretation is not so certain, but the interpretation by the archaeological school, according to which the Remnant is identified with Joseph, is certainly attractive. 3) They have also maintained the pre-prophetic character of the doctrine of the Messiah. This was supposed to be originally a mythological conception which later became attached to the Davidic dynasty and so historicised. A main proof for this thesis, and it is certainly a striking one, is the connection of the Golden Age with the Twig of Jesse in Is. 11. 4) Finally, Gressmann has produced

[144] This much has always been recognized by the neo-critical school; the implications of Amos 5 18 are too plain to be ignored.

[145] 'Pre-prophetic' is used by Gressmann of the period before Amos.

considerable evidence that the Gog prophecy in Ezekiel is not simply "the child of reflection" which it is usually taken to be, but contains many mythological and therefore pre-historic elements. But we have seen that the Messianic and especially the anti-Assyrian prophecies have been brought down to a later date partly because of their striking similarity to the *theologoumena* of Ezekiel. Thus Gunkel and Gressmann seek to cut in behind the neo-critical school and to show that the main features of the eschatology of hope which were supposed to be late post-exilic are in reality early pre-prophetic, having existed in popular form long before the eighth-century prophets, and some of them, because of their mythological character, being even pre-historic. This position may be regarded as the major premise of the archaeological school. Granting it to be true for the sake of the argument, does the archaeological school provide an adequate system of defense based on this premise to meet the attack of the neo-critics? I shall confine myself in what follows to a discussion of Gressmann's and Sellin's positions because these have been the most elaborately worked out.[146]

II. Gressmann and Sellin.

Gressmann begins by attacking the criteria utilized by the documentary school to cast doubt on the genuineness of the eschatology of hope. 1) In the first place, the criterion of language is inadequate, especially when drawn from a comparatively few verses. The justice of this criticism is increasingly recognized by scholars. Attention has already been called to the very subordinate place the argument occupies in the discussion of the disputed doctrines in Isaiah.[147] 2) The argument from difficulties in style, defective parallelisms etc. in the disputed prophecies is held to be equally unconvincing, for, it is claimed, the same phenomena meet us in the undisputed passages. This generalization needs considerable qualification. It is not true that the prophecies of doom, taken as a whole, are as stylistically defective as the prophecies of hope. The latter have not the charm

[146] See in particular *Ursprung*, pp. 238—250.
[147] See above p. 72.

of "winged words" which is so characteristic of the genuine passages. Further, Gressmann fails to draw a distinction between the stylistic defectiveness of a passage due to text-corruption and the stylistic defectiveness of a passage which is an inherent quality of it, where the stammering tongue betrays the stammering mind.[148] But the argument by which Gressmann seeks to support his criticism of the criteria of language and style is the really important thing. He claims that neither of these criteria can be successfully utilized because of the hopeless state of corruption of the original texts. This corruption is by no means due only to accident; it is attributable very largely to intentional changes. Even the original authors may have worked over their speeches and made them more prosaic![149] One wonders just what the purpose of such a performance might be. "Again, later exegetes and copyists have remodeled the text... emending, supplementing, abbreviating, explaining ... just as happens in hymn-books to-day"[150]. Thus the argument against the genuineness of a passage drawn from its vocabulary and style is met by the assertion that, owing to extensive textual changes both accidental and deliberate, it is difficult to say just what the vocabulary and style originally were. "Our attitude toward the text must be in principle suspicious".[151] 3) But a third objection is advanced, which is most far-reaching in character and leads from the criticism of the criteria of vocabulary and style to the criticism of the criterion of ideas. It is a consideration which seems to be advanced in order to meet the objection drawn from the fact that the Messianic passages were never referred to by Isaiah's immediate successors. In the prophecies of hope, we are told, the prophets were peculiarly dependent upon the popular mythological eschatology: "The content is only to a limited extent their own original product; how far the form is

[148] Compare 2 6-22 (a badly corrupted text) with c. 4 (a badly corrupted style).

[149] *Ursprung*, p. 240.

[150] *Ib.*

[151] *Ib.* At this point Gressmann and Harold Wiener are remarkably alike in their apologetic method, though in everything else they are poles apart.

theirs we cannot know. But when we reflect how relatively many are the mythological elements contained in the few passages of eschatological hope, we will not dare to deny that the prophets also depended in their expressions on their predecessors".[152] From this alleged dependence upon the earlier eschatology Gressmann infers that we are not to expect a recurrence of their characteristic style and ideas, "since they are absolutely isolated, and speak of things which are never touched upon elsewhere in a peculiar way".[153]

All this means, if the logic of Gressmann's first three arguments is accepted, an almost total lack of originality in the hopes of the eighth-century prophets. The texts have been so badly preserved that we cannot be sure of what the original style was. And even when we get back to the approximately original texts, we find that both the style and ideas are borrowed from earlier undocumented sources. Gressmann arrives at the revolutionary conclusion that *ideas no longer can serve as a critical criterion.* The only valid criterion he admits is the historical background.[154] This means, in principle, the abandonment of most of the hard-won results of neo-criticism, which, as we have seen, operates principally with the criterion of ideas, the abandonment even of any attempt to criticise the tradition implied in the present position of a prophecy in a given book, unless its historical background is clearly proved to be later, as in the case of the Babylonian prophecies. Dogma in the guise of tradition is thus practically reinstated. But why is Gressmann so sceptical of the traditional text and so trusting with respect to the traditional arrangements of the canon? A classic illustration of the lengths to which our author is prepared to go is found in his treatment of Is. 9 1–6.[155] Gressmann's analysis of the real character of this passage is probably correct. It is by

[152] P. 241. An admission, by the way, that the style in these prophecies *did* differ considerably from the style in the doom prophecies.

[153] P. 242. He says of Is. 9 1 ff. that the earlier it is dated, the more likely it is to have preserved an ancient tradition which later faded away completely, p. 283.

[154] P. 243.

[155] Pp. 279—284.

no means a self-explanatory passage and is full of difficulties on the supposition of its Isaianic authorship. These difficulties are fully admitted by Gressmann, but they make no more impression on his view of its genuineness than they would upon a post-Reformation theologian's. The general style of the passage, we are told, is not Isaiah's; it belongs either to the 'court' style or the 'eschatological' style, and in either case is borrowed from traditional formulas. The particular form of the passage must not be attributed to him; it is too loosely put together to be the work of such an excellent stylist. Lastly the ideas are not Isaiah's; they are mythical and hence could not have originated with him, but must have been borrowed from primitive tradition. I have never before chanced upon an apologetic method which seeks to defend the genuineness of a passage by pointing out that in not one single particular has it any relationship to the reputed author's style or thought.[156] Such a defense has the merit of originality, at any rate. Can the existence of a conventional style and a body of conventional ideas, by the assumption of which this astonishing result is achieved, really take the place of the coherence of thought which we have a right to expect in a man of Isaiah's mental powers? This raises once more the question of the legitimacy of the criterion of ideas in critical discussion. But before this can be more fully treated it is necessary to consider the way in which Gressmann disposes of another objection raised against the genuineness of the hope prophecies by the documentary school. 4) This objection is drawn from the contexts of most of the disputed prophecies. They stand in the most impossible contexts, and from this their spuriousness has been inferred. Gressmann, as usual, admits the premise but denies the conclusion. He turns the argument in the same way as he sought to turn the preceding arguments. The lack of connections observable in the case of the hope prophecies are also seen in the case of the doom prophecies. *All* the prophetic

[156] Gressmann seeks to avoid the inevitable consequences of his position when he says: "Because of the dependence of the prophets upon such a conventionalized style, their originality, of course must not be minimized, though it cannot always be proved in detail" (p. 281). This assertion in general of what is denied in particular fails to carry any conviction.

utterances are fragmentary and unconnected. The analogy is drawn between them and the synoptic Gospels in which so many unconnected logia are found.[157] Thus Gressmann adopts the fragmentary hypothesis of Isaiah in its extremest form and makes capital out of it for his own purposes. Everything in the book being fragmentary, the argument from the lack of connection is claimed to be no longer pertinent. This counter is ingenious but not adequate. The neo-critical argument is not simply from the lack of connection, but from the *contradictory character of the connection* which is established in the present compilation. The analogy with the Gospels would be more exact if, after every passage which opposed the legalism of the Pharisees, we should find a passage which would support that legalism, such as we actually do find at Mt. 5 19. The prophecies of hope not only lack organic connection with their contexts, they usually paralyse the prophecies of doom, and this is done so regularly as to appear to be deliberate. Gressmann feels this difficulty and introduces a new consideration in order to meet it, namely, Style. Possibly the juxtaposition of hope and doom "is the remnant of an eschatological style according to which the singer first recited a song that treated of the time of doom and in immediate connection therewith another song that glorified the time of blessing. *We cannot adequately estimate the mighty power of the Style*".[158] In the American Journal of Theology for 1913 (p. 176) Gressmann suggests a somewhat different explanation: "The promises are as different from the threats as love songs from funeral dirges. . . . But unless special reasons force us to do so, we have no right to establish a connection between a threat and a promise, for a poem rounded out in itself is not to be joined to another poem complete in itself. This simple consideration disposes of nearly all the arguments against the authenticity of . . . the Messianic hopes . . . It is said the prophet could not threaten and promise at one and the same time. But he does not do so. The conjunction of the two is purely arbitrary. But there is no reason why a prophet should not threaten at one time and promise at another, just as the poet may now mourn the death of a friend and again sing as

157 P. 239. 158 P. 244.

a lover". A simple consideration indeed! Granted that the poet may sing a dirge or a love-ditty at different times, is it his habit to combine them: dirge and ditty, dirge and ditty, dirge and ditty? Is it not possible to group poems of similar nature together? The compiler of the Lamentations certainly had a sense of the fitness of things and so did the compiler of Songs; if Lamentations and Songs were combined together, we would no doubt have a new and remarkable instance of Gressmann's "style" and just about as intelligible as the examples we now find in Isaiah. But Gressmann's analogy breaks down at another point. Isaiah is neither a troubadour nor a professional elegist. He is a prophet, and a prophet who, on Gressmann's own showing, took his work very seriously. The dirge-and-ditty theory cannot possibly apply to his work. Why should a prophet whose message is one of warning (c. 6) regularly accompany it with happy tunes. Is it conceivable that Isaiah deliberately set about to polarize his own lightning in this fashion? Even Gressmann seems to have qualms at this point. He is not quite clear at times as to whether the sequence of fear and hope is due to the original author or to the compiler. If the later alternative is adopted, Gressmann's defense of the genuineness of the hope passages is seriously weakened. Once admit the compiler's hand in these suspicious sequences, and the question will inevitably be raised whether his work consists *only* in arrangement. If the later revisers are ready to emend texts as freely as Gressmann admits, what is to hinder them from supplementing the ancient oracles by observations of their own? On the other hand, if the prophets themselves were responsible for these sequences, is not their mental integrity seriously compromised? Thus far Gressmann has sought to meet (as I believe unavailingly) the argument from vocabulary, style, ideas, and contextual relationships against the genuineness of the hope prophecies. But there is a fifth argument against them which Gressmann admits to be the strongest of all. 5) The fact of the contradictory connections between the threats and the hopes cannot be properly estimated apart from the further fact that the eschatology of hope is in fundamental opposition to the eschatology of doom. In view of this second fact the

present artificial connections between the two groups gains a new significance. It is noticeable that Gressmann does not bring these two objections together as he should do; he prefers to destroy them separately. In this he follows the Hengstenberg-Keil method of apologetic, which always went on the supposition that critical arguments follow the analogy of a chain which is destroyed when its separate links are broken, and not the analogy of a rope which is by no means rendered useless even though separate strands may be severed. But Gressmann places himself squarely on the neo-critical hypothesis that the pre-exilic prophets are messengers of doom, and he distinguishes these "stormy petrels" from those birds of calm, the post-exilic prophets who preach hope. However, says Gressmann, the prophets were after all human beings. They were patriots; they loved their nation. We cannot expect them to be everywhere and always absolutely logical. They must have yielded at times to the popular hopes. The few, and Gressmann admits there are but few, genuine prophecies of hope, are the concessions which they made to the popular eschatology.[159] This sounds plausible and psychologically quite intelligible as an abstract proposition.[160] It appeals to us of the present day. Moreover (and here Gressmann plays his trump card), the documentary critic must admit that at one point Isaiah actually took over one of the great doctrines in the eschatology of hope, namely the doctrine of the Remnant. But "with [the acceptance of] the doctrine of the Remnant, the rigid eschatology of doom is broken through. A breach has now been made through which the whole, or at least the greater part, of the eschatology of hope can enter. Whether a little more or a little less, that was left to the taste of the individual prophet".[161] Bud did Isaiah have a taste for the old popular eschatology of hope with its many mythical features, which Gressmann takes particular pains to tell us must be pre-prophetic because it could not possibly have arisen out of the advanced ethical theology of the prophets? How are we to decide this question? We

[159] P. 242 ff., 236, 68.

[160] Perhaps at this point Gressmann himself does not escape the danger of modernizing the prophets which the neo-critics are supposed to run.

[161] P. 243.

have just three data to guide us: a) The precise definition of his message given by the prophet himself in the account of his call (c. 6), namely, to announce the doom of the nation; b) the general historical and religious situation which is known with some particularity—a time of political crisis occasioned by the Assyrian advance and a time of ethical abuses and religious apostasy; c) finally, our estimate of the man's creative power, which can be gathered from his undisputed prophecies and which show him to be a man of genius. Now, to hold that a man of such force and originality, a man, also, of such literary skill, profoundly convinced as he was of the people's apostasy from God and with no evidence of their repentance, should be responsible for the artificial sequences of fear and hope existing in the present book is simply inconceivable. Scorn of psychologizing criticism and the suggestion that Isaiah is dependent in the present arrangement of his prophecies upon a prophetic style are trivial. The present connections cannot be his work. But once more the question presses: May the prophecies be by him even though the connections between them are not? Here the point urged by Gressmann must be admitted. Isaiah did borrow the thought of the Remnant in all probability out of the popular eschatology of hope. But this very example, instead of making in favor of Gressmann's thesis, makes decidedly against it, for the thought of the Remnant, which seems to have been without any clear moral significance in the popular eschatology, has been moralized by Isaiah in exactly the same way as the popular eschatological doctrine of the Day of the Lord was moralized by Amos. When Isaiah adds his שאר ישוב to 7 3 and follows this up by a promise of deliverance only on condition of faith (7 9), he has infused a profound moral meaning into the idea of the Remnant. The Remnant implies punishment for sin and is thus connected with the eschatology of doom; but the "shall return" implies repentance and thus the modulation from doom to hope which the Remnant idea implies is given a deeply ethical significance.[162] Thus, in the case of the Remnant, we

[162] Professor J. M. P. Smith's recently proposed solution of the name שאר ישוב (ZATW, 1914, pp. 219—224) which robs it of its spiritual meaning, seems to me to be against the context with its insistence upon faith.

really have a detail out of the eschatology of hope taken over by the prophet but characteristically fused with his own distinctive doctrines. The contrast at this point with the disputed eschatological doctrines is most instructive. For example, if Isaiah had really adopted the doctrine of the Messianic King out of the tradition as Gressmann maintains, we would certainly expect him to have assimilated it to his own thinking more fully than according to Gressmann's representations he actually did do. Our author's interpretation of 7 14, 9 1–6, 11 1ff. is only a new confirmation of the neo-critical contentions that the idea of the Messiah was fundamentally alien to Isaiah's thinking. Granted that he might have adopted such a doctrine out of the popular eschatology, would he not have excluded from it the mythical elements which in Gressmann's view were attached to it and which conflicted with his theology? Was he not a clear enough and logical enough thinker to do that? Gressmann himself speaks of the "grand one-sidedness" of the eighth-century prophets.[163] They follow out a premise to its bitter conclusion. Are such men likely to confuse their thinking by the admission into it of popular elements which would compromise their theology and their exhortations at the same time?[164] What is true of the Messianic group is preeminently true of the anti-Assyrian group. They are much less moralized than the Messianic prophecies[165] and are admitted

163 "The more we sink ourselves in them the more we discover upon what an isolated height they stand, in their grand one-sidedness without compare" (p. 141).

164 It is not denied that there are certain moral features and that, too, attractive ones, in the portraiture of the Messiah in Is. cc. 9 and 11, but it is claimed the figure does not embody the peculiar religious and ethical interests of Isaiah in the way we would expect, if he was its painter (cf. above, pp. 37—40, 64). He does not relate the doctrine of the Messianic King to his message of doom, or to his doctrine of faith, or to his doctrine of of the Remnant.

165 10 12 might be thought to inject a moralizing tone into the greatest of the anti-Assyrian prophecies and because of this it was defended by Hackmann (see above n. 107). But the style of the verse makes heavily against it and, further, it is interesting to observe how the chastisement of Judah is pushed into a subordinate clause. It becomes only a passing incident in the development of Jahweh's plan which, when v. 12 is accepted as genuine, really culminates in the destruction of Assyria and the deliver-

by Gressmann to be out of harmony with their contexts and with the essence of Isaiah's message.[166] But we are asked to believe that he uttered these oracles, though they were opposed to his profoundest convictions and most prejudicial to the effect of his message, as concessions to the people, and because his patriotism and natural instincts prompted him to indulge in these fancies, and that the extent to which he indulged in them was only a matter of taste! This might do for other prophets, but not for Isaiah. In his case, if anywhere, the criterion of ideas would seem to be applicable. Judged by the commission originally given him, by the demands of his times, and by the creative power displayed in the undisputed prophecies, the unorganized and contradictory character of the eschatology of hope, exclusive of the Remnant idea, must arouse the gravest suspicion. Therefore, is not the neo-critical denial of its genuineness legitimate? By no means, says Gressmann. Such a conclusion ignores the fact of STYLE.

Style—that is the final word in Gressmann's defense of the eschatology of hope in Isaiah. Let us see just how this golden key is perfectly fitted to unlock all the mysteries which have hitherto barred the way to an intelligible theory of Isaiah's prophecies if the great body of cc. 1—39 is accepted as genuine. To begin with, while the disorganization of the eschatology of hope is admitted, we must not take it too seriously. The eschatology of doom is also fragmentary. But just as each half of the whole eschatological construction is disintegrated, so the connection between the two halves is disintegrated. Isaiah is not to be blamed for this state of affairs. Both the eschatology of doom and the eschatology of hope had already become disintegrated before they reached him. Gressmann assumes that in prehistoric times there was a great myth of the destruction of the world and its subsequent restoration, and that the eschatologies of doom and hope both go back to this myth. But by the time these fragments reached the prophets their original connections had been largely forgotten and they had ceased to

ance of Judah, according to the present form of the chapter. 10 21-23 can only be defended as Isaiah's when separated from their anti-Assyrian context, and even then they are very doubtful.

166 Cf. pp. 177—179 with special reference to 8 9 f., 17 11 ff., 29 7.

have any clear and definite meaning. Their ideas had become transformed in the popular eschatology into mere conventions, in other words into a style! Because the prophets adopted these faded-out mythological ideas and the technical terms in which they were expressed from tradition as a part of a conventional eschatological apparatus, they did not trouble themselves about the exact meanings either of the ideas or the terminology, and for the same reason the modern exegete is absolved from all responsibility to discover the original meaning of many of these eschatological details. It is not necessary, we are told, for a style to have any meaning.[167] Thus mythology, faded-out into a convention, a style, takes the place of psychology in criticism and interpretation.[168] How far Gressmann is willing to drive this argument at times is seen in his exposition, if it can be called such, of Is. 7 14. The prophet was using materials furnished by the tradition, which had ceased to have any clearly defined meaning. Thus all the difficulties which have from time immemorial plagued the psychologizing exegesis in its attempts to find a meaning in this passage are airily brushed aside by the assumption that the ideas in this oracle had little meaning for Isaiah himself. The ideas had already become very largely only style for Isaiah; they need remain only style for us also.[169]

[167] "Where there is a style no one asks whether is has any sense or not" (p. 256, cf. 277, 311).

[168] Compare for the substitution of mythology for psychology pp. 193, 195, 196, 198, 216, 244, 253, 255 etc.

[169] Cf. pp. 270—278 "As soon as one assumes that the material is borrowed by Isaiah from the tradition, one is relieved of the above-mentioned difficulties [i. e. the difficulties which have always been found in the Immanuel prophecy]. For from now on one need no longer attach any importance to details, because they are not created *ad hoc* but are handed down in the tradition" (p. 276 f.). It is this utter irresponsibility in the exegesis of the archaeological school which must be deplored. There is undoubtedly a truth in this discovery of a style which must be reckoned with. Gressmann makes very suggestive use of it in his treatment of the idea of the Day of the Lord as expressed in Is. 2. But the fact of style is a fact which must be handled with the greatest care, or it will land him who trusts to it in absurdity. Style is a fire lit to consume away exegetical briars and thorns, but it soon gets beyond control, if one is not very careful.

But why did the prophet resort to these conventional ideas and this meaningless terminology? It was in order to lend his thoughts impressiveness. He spoke *ἐν μυστηρίῳ*. Can such suggestions really relieve the difficulties of 7 14? Can it be supposed that at one of the greatest crises of Isaiah's life, when, if ever, a message of vital significance was to be expected from him, the prophet was ready to indulge in abracadabra? The fact is, the more Gressmann resorts to style in his defense of the disputed passages, the more he is unconsciously driven to revive the patristic theory of prophecy in a new form. Clement of Alexandria compares Isaiah to the Pythian Apollo who is called Loxias, a title supposed to signify 'oblique',[170] and Tertullian tells us that "God conceals by his preparatory apparatus of prophetic obscurity, the understanding which is open to faith".[171] But is it really credible that a man of such mental integrity and profound seriousness of purpose as Isaiah would cultivate a prophetic style at the expense of prophetic sincerity? A defense of the genuineness of the disputed passages in which mythology and style have become substituted for moral meaning and coherence of thought is one which can afford little comfort, I fancy, to those who are still looking for some cement with which to mend the shattered unity of Isaiah.

But has this defense any scientific advantage over the hypothesis of the neo-critical school? Is it really more probable that the *disjecta membra* of the eschatology of hope were borrowed by Isaiah himself and scattered through his prophecies in the weird fashion in which we now find them, than that they were incorporated by editors of a later day? At this point Gressmann's own admission of revision threatens to undermine the defense which he has so laboriously built up. 6) "A final judgment [upon the question of genuineness] will be possible only when we get a clear idea of the literary composition of the prophetical books, and of the principles by which the sayings

[170] *Stromata*, V. 4.

[171] *Against Marcion*, IV. 25. It is interesting to see how followers of the Gunkel-Gressmann method also go back at times to the theory of the double sense of Scripture without being aware of it. Cf. Herrmann, *Der Messias aus Davids Geschlecht*, ZWTh, 1909, p. 264.

have been arranged."[172] This statement of Gressmann is fundamental. *The question of the genuineness of the disputed prophecies is bound up with the question of an adequate theory of compilation.* Such a theory the neo-critical school actually offers; the critical movement culminates in it,[173] but such a theory the archaeological school fails to offer. Yet the astonishing thing is that Gressmann unhesitatingly adopts the premises upon which the neo-critical theory of revision is based. a) As we have seen, he admits the most extensive revision in the text. But if the texts can be so drastically edited, may not the contents of certain passages also be due to later compilers? Is it not easier to suppose that the incongruous eschatological passages were inserted during the changed conditions after the exile than that Isaiah was guilty of such hackwork? b) This supposition is strengthened by another observation for which Gressmann is indebted to his opponents. He realizes how small a part the eschatology of hope plays in pre-exilic prophecy, but how it absorbs the attention and becomes more coherent in post-exilic prophecy. "What a strange riddle," he exclaims, "first the ruin [the fragmentary eschatology of the pre-exilic period], then the stately castle [the organized eschatology of the post-exilic period]".[174] How is this to be explained? It must be due, we are told, to two migrations of eschatological material into Palestine, one in prehistoric times, upon the fragments of which the early prophets depended, the second much later, when the fusion of oriental religions was much more pronounced.[175] But has not Gressmann endangered the success of his whole campaign by this admission? In attempting to flank the neo-critical attack by the assumption of a pre-prophetic eschatology, has he not exposed his own flank to a very dangerous counter attack? He admits the fact of later extensive revisions, and the fact that when they were made the interest in the eschatology of hope was paramount. What, then, is more natural than the neo-

[172] P. 243.

[173] See above p. 69.

[174] P. 247.

[175] Gressmann admits his indebtedness to Gunkel for this suggestion. See p. 247, n. 1.

critical theory, according to which the revision was made in the interest of this dominant eschatology? Gressmann is on the watch for just this use of his admissions. He answers: "One might be able to regard the mythical elements in the eschatology of hope which, in themselves, must be ancient, as possibly a post-exilic dependence of Israel upon another people; but these mythical fragments of the eschatology of hope are inseparably connected with the eschatology of doom. The Israelite religion would be an insoluble enigma if the two eschatologies . . . . which belong to each other as the two shells of a clam, had migrated into Israel at different times. With what probability could it be supposed that the Israelites borrowed all that was connected with doom before the exile and all that was connected with hope, carefully sifted from the doom, after the exile?"[176] This posing of the question, so far as it concerns the problem of the disputed passages in Isaiah, is entirely misleading. It leaves out of consideration another alternative. The question is not whether all doom entered Israel before the exile and all hope after it; it is whether, granted a pre-prophetic eschatology of hope as well as of doom, Isaiah absorbed the former as well as the latter. It is not only conceivable that Isaiah may have resisted the encroachments of the eschatology of hope, but altogether probable that he did do so. The incongruity of the eschatology of hope both with Isaiah's thought and in the arrangement of his prophecies is admitted by Gressmann. Is the creative genius of Isaiah so powerless in the presence of this traditional material as Gressmann's representations would imply? Gressmann is fond of picturing the various elements in the eschatology of hope as isolated stones or columns, the fragmentary ruins of a once glorious temple.[177] Is Isaiah so unimaginative an architect that he cannot build these fragments up again into something like unity, if he cared to do so? One of these fragments is the doctrine of the Remnant, and this fragment Isaiah *did* use most effectively. Why did he not use the doctrines of the Inviolability of Zion and the Messianic King in the same artistic way instead of in the mechanical way which Gressmann compels us to assume?

[176] P. 245.

[177] P. 238, cf. 232, 191.

What Gressmann's theory amounts to when reduced to its simplest terms is just this: He has substituted for the criterion of ideas a blind faith in tradition. Because the disputed doctrines are found attributed to Isaiah in the present anthology known as the Book of Isaiah, therefore they are by Isaiah. The utter confusion and disorganization in the book and in Isaiah's message which this tradition implies are of no moment. Their evidence can be explained away by the newly discovered solvent of all critical difficulties—Style. Once more the question must be pressed: Can such a theory have any scientific advantage over the theory of the neo-critical school?[178]

[178] At this point an adequate criticism of Sellin's work, *Der alttestamentliche Prophetismus*, ought to be introduced, but limitations of time and space prevent any detailed discussion of it. A few remarks upon his general method and aims must suffice. 1) Sellin is an ardent champion of the archaeological method and with all Gressmann's zeal seeks to deduce from present documented obscurities earlier undocumented ideas. He is therefore an opponent of psychologizing in exegesis (cf. the discussion of principles, pp. 105—112, 167 f.) and an advocate of style (cf. p. 170). 2) But at an all-important point he introduces a modification of Gressmann. Gressmann operated extensively with mythology; eschatology for him, both in its threats and in its promises, was rooted in mythology. The most convincing proof that Gressmann has to offer that eschatology is pre-prophetic is the fact that it is mythological. But Sellin seems instinctively to feel the difficulty at this point. The more the mythological character of eschatology is emphasized, in order to prove its pre-prophetic origin, the less likely it becomes that the prophets would make use of it. Hence Sellin labors to substitute morals for mythology in the pre-prophetic eschatology. Sellin will have nothing to do with Gressmann's primeval eschatological myth which reached Israel in a thoroughly disintegrated state. Eschatology goes back to the experiences at Sinai. From the outset Jahweh has the quality of a world-king, but his kingship was to be only gradually manifested. "The origin of the entire Old Testament eschatology is found in the act of revelation at Sinai, through which the germinal hope of a future analogous appearance of Jahweh for the purpose of entering on his world rule, was implanted deep in the heart of the people" (p. 148). At the conquest Jahweh's kingship was partially manifested, but under the Canaanite and Philistine oppression it was gradually realized by the more thoughtful that its complete manifestation was still in the future (cf. p. 184, a lapse into the sin of psychologizing against which Sellin should have more carefully guarded himself). As king, Jahweh was to exercise the functions of

Conclusions.

But are we, then, to conclude that Gressmann's brilliant monograph is only a meteoric flash in the exegetical firmament? Far from it. Gressmann's defense of the disputed prophecies in

Judge and Savior, two thoughts which provide the basis for the eschatologies of doom and hope. These are no longer regarded as disconnected; they are united in the idea of Jahweh's functions as king (p. 132), and as the judgment and salvation are moralized by Sellin, the eschatology which is based on them also becomes moralized. The evidence for all this is admitted to be most meagre (p. 184 f.), and it may be added that such evidence as is offered is of a highly questionable character. Furthermore, Sellin's attempt to banish all mythology behind the mountain barrier of Sinai breaks down. To be sure, he tries to destroy the life of any myths that might chance to cross this mountain wall and to turn them into dead pictures and metaphors, and he suggests that most of the eschatological hopes take their coloring not from myths but from the historical experiences at Sinai and at the conquest of Palestine (cf. 146 ff., 167). But he admits that it is difficult to distinguish at times between the mythical and what he calls the historical (p. 147). In the case of the Messiah the distinction completely breaks down. Sellin finds the roots of the doctrine of the Messiah in the ancient oriental conception of a primeval man, a Paradise-King. But he must resort to hypothetical extra-biblical sources for this conception, since he admits it is not found in the account of Paradise in Gen. 2 and 3 (p. 183). 3) Sellin does not discuss the problem of the doctrine of the Inviolability of Zion, for, strictly speaking, it hardly belongs to his particular subject. Apart from the above very questionable speculations, he seeks to prove the ancient character of the Messianic idea from three groups of passages: a) Is. 7 14, which refers to the well-known 'almah of the eschatological tradition (cf. Gressmann), 9 1 ff., 11 1 ff.; b) the royal psalms, which, it is claimed, can only be explained by the supposition that the eschatological style has been adopted into the court style, and therefore, because these royal psalms must be pre-exilic, the eschatological style which they imply must be still earlier; and c) such passages as Gen. 49 10, the Balaam oracles, and Dt. 33 13 ff. (pp. 167—172). Sellin's use of Is. 7 14 is like Gressmann's and that has already been sufficiently considered. The last group of passages will be considered hereafter, and it will be shown that they make *against* the originality of the Messianic hopes in Isaiah. The argument for the early date of the doctrine of the Messiah drawn from the royal psalms is of the most precarious character, but even if it is granted, it cannot be used to support the genuineness of the disputed passages in Isaiah any more than Gen. 49 19, the Balaam oracles and Dt. 33 13 (see below). 4) And here we arrive at the fundamental weakness of Sellin's

Isaiah is a failure; yet I believe archaeological criticism, when soberly used, will prove to be a valuable corrective to the method of documentary criticism. He has established with great probability the fact of a mythological background for eschatology and therefore a background of high antiquity, out of which much that has hitherto escaped attention gains a new significance and much that has been a source of perplexity is explained. If the fact of a pre-prophetic eschatology is once accepted and combined with one further fact to which Gressmann calls attention, an entirely new perspective is opened up in which to view the problem of Isaiah. The passage in which this combination is made is so important that I venture to quote it at length. "Since eschatology is earlier than Amos, there must have once existed before our canonical worthies certain prophetical schools which glorified the eschatological facts in word and song. The Nebi'im emerge in Samuel's day. In their circles ecstasy was cultivated, which flamed out especially at times of national excitement. Religious patriotism was constantly kindled anew by these men,

book. He assumes that, if once the pre-prophetic date of the Messianic eschatology is accepted, the genuineness of the disputed passages in Isaiah has been established. "We are certain", he says, "that this expectation [of a Messiah] is primitive, already in existence in the prophetic period, and that *in consequence the Tradition as to the origin of the most of the Messianic passages in the scriptures of this period is trustworthy*" (p. 172, see above, p. 93). In view of this assumption, Sellin feels himself to be relieved of the obligation to discuss what we have seen to be the controlling factor in the whole problem, namely the peculiar method of compiling the Book of Isaiah. This point is referred to but once, so far as I have observed, and then very briefly. Sellin advances the two explanations already proposed by Gressmann (see above, p. 82 ff.). Either the prophecies of threat and hope were uttered at different times and were later brought together by compilers, or it may have been a "poetic-prophetic" style to connect them as they are now connected (p. 149). It is unnecessary to repeat the criticisms already passed upon these suggestions. In Sellin's work we have only one more example of the tendency of thought to move in cycles and return to its original starting-points. Gressmann sought to defend the originality of the Messianic passages by the archaeological method of exegesis and the assumption of a great pre-historic eschatological myth. Sellin adopts the exegetical method, rejects the myth in part and goes back only to Sinai. It remains for a still more resolute spirit to rehabilitate Hengstenberg's *Christologie*.

and at times they took a hand in the political crises. These pre-canonical and extra-canonical prophets were half politicians, half soothsayers; only we must deny to them on the average the ethical and religious greatness of our prophets. Although it is not recorded, there is nothing to hinder the supposition that the Nebi'im already cultivated eschatology[179] and handed down the stylistic forms which the canonical prophets made use of. From whom should the latter have received their traditions, if not from those who bore the same name with them? We must . . . hold that in the ancient period . . . the Nebi'im cultivated eschatology in its entirety, but in the form which we have characterized as popular. Afterwards, beginning with Amos, *a cleavage arose within prophecy, in consequence of which the prophetical development ran parallel to the popular development*".[180] This passage gives food for thought. Gressmann makes use of it to defend the eschatology of hope in Isaiah. Granted the existence of both a pre-prophetic eschatology of hope and also of doom, which "belong together like the two shells of a clam, how should one group of the prophets have sung exclusively of disaster while the other group sang exclusively of hope"?[181] But may not the argument be just reversed, and the connection established by Gressmann between uncanonical prophecy and the eschatology of hope be an additional argument against its genuineness? Here the following facts are to be considered.

1) Gressmann points out how the uncanonical prophets probably utilized the current eschatology in an aggressive nationalistic interest.[182] They were the one hundred per cent patriots of their day. Isaiah, like Jeremiah, was nothing of the kind. Throughout his life he was opposed to the political ventures of Judah. Would such a man have a "taste" for an eschatology that was proclaimed in the interest of a dangerous nationalism? 2) Again, Gressmann argues that because the doom and the hope sides of eschatology belong to each other as the two shells of a clam, it is unlikely

[179] The priests may also be included (cf. Volz, ThLZ 1906, Col. 675).
[180] P. 155 ff.
[181] Pp. 156, 245.
[182] See also above, n. 95, end.

that the uncanonical and the canonical prophets, like the walrus and the carpenter, divided up the bivalves so exactly between them.[183] But elsewhere, when Gressmann wishes to account for the present impossible sequences in Isaiah, he is at pains to demonstrate that the original connection between the two clam-shells had been completely broken down and the prophets themselves were no longer conscious of it. In that case Isaiah may very easily have selected those elements in the popular eschatology which could be made to emphasize his message and have rejected those elements which confused it. 3) As a matter of fact, that is just what he did do in the case of the doctrines of the Day of the Lord and the Remnant. He reformulated them in opposition to the popular eschatology. Was it likely that he would insert into his great prophetic construction still other blocks of the eschatology of hope without attempting to square them off into some sort of symmetry with the rest of his material?[184] On the contrary, if Gressmann's theory of the existence of a popular pre-prophetic eschatology is accepted, have we not a new gauge of the forcefulness and originality of Isaiah? He resisted the temptation to yield to the pseudo-patriotism of his day or to encourage its false hopes. Thus Gressmann supplies just the background needed to throw the isolated grandeur of our prophet into strong relief. But he does something more than this. 4) His theory of a pre-prophetic popular eschatology furnishes at once a needed corrective and a welcome support to the neo-critical theory of the compilation of Isaiah. This theory tended to transfer all the eschatology of hope to the exilic or post-exilic periods. The result was that the Messianic eschatology appeared to be too much of a surprise in the historical development. It arose too suddenly, was too little prepared for; hence the attempt in the neo-critical school to explain it as a 'child of reflection'. Gressmann's protest against this is timely. He calls attention to many elements in the eschatology of hope

[183] P. 156.

[184] It is interesting to observe how Sellin (pp. 186—190) admits that Isaiah and the other prophets set much of their own eschatology into the sharpest antithesis to the popular eschatology, but in the case of the Messiah this was not done. Why not?

(especially the golden age) which cannot well be so explained. The documentary critics, or at least their popularizers, have too often made the same mistake here as they have made in the case of the P material. Because its present form and meaning are late, the fact is often overlooked that a large part of its contents is not only pre-exilic but actually primitive in origin. Gressmann's investigations supply the means by which the post-exilic eschatology can be recognized as organically connected with the past without at the same time endangering the neo-critical theory. They go to show that the Messianic eschatology had its roots sunk deep into the past, though they were sunk, not in the soil of pre-exilic canonical prophecy as Gressmann and Sellin maintain, but in the soil of pre-exilic uncanonical prophecy.[185] Even in that case it sprang out of the deep rich soil of history and was not simply the fruit of reflection. It is not only conceivable but highly probable, in view of what has been said, that Amos, Isaiah, and Micah, and possibly Hosea, set their faces as a flint against the popular eschatology of their day, whereas the later prophets may not have done so as consistently.[186] The changed historical situation would easily account

[185] When Volz (pp. 74—78) suggested that the doctrine of the Messiah appeared in connection with the Deuteronomic reforms, he, too, evidently felt the difficulty of supposing that it sprang into existence fully developed, and therefore he suggested that this doctrine had been previously cultivated by the uncanonical prophets (pp. 88, 91).

[186] In this connection I would raise the question whether a much larger amount of material in the Old Testament than is commonly supposed did not originate within the circles which we are accustomed to characterize as uncanonical prophets. Strictly speaking, the use of the terms 'canonical' and 'uncanonical' prophets is inaccurate in this connection. At the time when this material was composed there was of course no division between canonical and uncanonical prophets, for there was as yet no canon. Our prophets speak of their opponents as 'false' prophets. But would the distinction between the false and the true prophets have always been obvious to contemporaries? By no means. Furthermore it would be as much against historical analogy to suppose that all the prophets of the eighth century were bad except Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah as it would be to suppose that all Pharisees in New Testament times were bad. There must have been gradations of all sorts within the general movement of prophecy. Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah were four individuals within this general movement, who held a common

for the changed attitude, and from the time of Ezekiel on, the eschatology of hope could easily gain an ascendency over the eschatology of doom. The development of Messianic eschatology

point of view. But it was a minority point of view, and so far as we can gather it had little effect upon their contemporaries. There must also have been a considerable literature representing majority opinions. Just because it *did* represent majority opinion, that is, current opinion, it could easily lapse into the anonymity which is the usual characteristic of Semitic literature. On the other hand, the very fact that the writings of the four great prophets differed so startlingly from the writings of their contemporaries would tend to the preservation of the names of their authors, especially when their attitude was, at least, in part, justified by the events. Now the point of all this is, that it is altogether probable that we have also preserved to us prophecies or poetry which represented the majority views. Sachsse, who admits gradations among the uncanonical prophets (*Die Propheten des A. T. und ihre Gegner*, p. 8) should go further and also admit gradations in the prophetical literature which afterwards became canonized. The fact that the majority views were not always vindicated by the event would by no means signify that they would be ultimately repudiated altogether. They expressed the general hopes and beliefs of the people, and people are not so ready to give up what they like, even though they have incurred disappointments in holding on to it. One clear case of a prophecy representing the popular point of view, though out of a somewhat later time, is that of Nahum. There are also a few precious fragments out of a much earlier time which reflect the same general point of view. These are the poems or prophecies upon which Gressmann and Sellin especially rely to prove a pre-prophetic eschatology of hope. They are Judges 5, Gen. 49, Dt. 33 and the Balaam oracles (Numbers 23, 24). These fragments are generally supposed to antedate the prophetic movement. In all of them a very intense nationalism is expressed. Now it is a striking fact that instead of building upon the ideas in these fragments, our eighth-century prophets are in violent opposition to them. Indeed, it almost seems, at times, as if they were consciously preaching against them. The significance of this antithesis so far as I have observed has been largely overlooked. a) Compare the blessings upon Joseph in Gen. 49 25-26 and Hosea's terrible curses in 9 11, 12, 14, 16, and 10 1, 13 1. b) Compare Dt. 33 17 and 1 Kings 22 11. The passage in Kings, even though it may be much later than the eighth-century prophecy, reflects quite accurately the opposition of that prophecy to what it considered to be false prophecy. c) I would call especial attention to Nu. 23 21 b, according to which the claim is made that Jahweh is with Israel, contrasted with the exhortation in Amos 5 14, "Let Jahweh God of Hosts be with you *as ye have said*". The contradiction is not only in idea but in the words themselves. d) Finally compare Nu. 23 9 b

would then be precisely analogous to the development of the Law. This, too, as cult practice, originated in primitive times. The early prophets denounced it in the most uncompromising terms. Yet it managed to secure a good orthodox position within the canon later on.[187] Similarly, we may surmise, the eschatology which had been repudiated by the earlier prophets of the eighth century was gradually adopted by the prophets of later ages. As prophecy in spite of its great leaders made terms with the Law in Deuteronomy, so it made terms with eschatology in the post-exilic period. We need not predicate two distinct migrations of eschatology as Gressmann does, one very ancient and the other in post-exilic times. Rather, the ancient

with the prologue to Amos. In the Balaam oracle there is the most intense national self-consciousness and feeling of superiority to other nations; in Amos Israel is included in the common doom of the nations (Amos 1 and 2). In all these early poems nationalism is highly developed; it is the stock in trade of the majority prophets from the time of Jonah the son of Amittai (2 K. 14 25) to the time of Jeremiah's opponents. But it is this very nationalism that is rebuked by eighth-century prophecy and later by Jeremiah. Accordingly, these poems are the last places to look for support in defending the eschatology of hope in eighth-century prophecy. On the contrary, the prophetic opposition to them shows how unlikely it would be for the prophets to share their hopes. If Sellin's view could be proved, that the royal psalms were early and had borrowed a still earlier eschatological style, the prophets would be found in the same opposition to them as to these other poems.

[187] This analogy was first suggested to me by Professor J. M. P. Smith in a personal conversation in which I was sketching out to him the general positions advanced above. In this connection the statement of Stade is important: "The reconciliation of the prophetic thoughts about religion with the popular thoughts and customs is completed in the exile" (*Biblische Theologie* I. p. 209). This statement applies to eschatology as well as to the cult. When Stade says that the catastrophe of the Exile led to the rejection of the prophecies of Jeremiah's opponents, so that nothing of this literature has come down to us (p. 216), he goes too far. The ideas of Jeremiah's opponents certainly persisted after a fashion, and at least some of the still earlier literature which reflected the same doctrines may well have been preserved. Its antiquity would clothe it with sanctity. The Psalter is the great store-house of this popular eschatology in the post-exilic period. In the Psalter the tendencies of legalism, majority prophecy and minority prophecy are found in the most interesting juxtaposition.

eschatology, suppressed for a time by the stern puritanism of the early prophets, gradually worked its way to the surface in their post-exilic successors[188] and became particularly influential in the revision of the ancient texts.[189] As has often happened in the history of religion, the popular, the superficial, the dogmatic, triumphed over the essential, the inward, the spiritual. The early prophets did not make concessions to popular hopes, but prophecy in its later developments did do this. Prophecy was many-sided, but the early prophets were one-sided. They drove their ethical premises to the limit. Therein they were not modern, and it is at *this* point that we must be on our guard against the temptation to modernize them. Their ethical abandon had, as Hölscher well brings out, a touch of the ancient nabi' in it, his intenseness, his ecstatic temperament.[190] That interpretation which emphasizes the ethical and spiritual in them rather than the supernaturalistic and apocalyptic is not an attempt to modernize them, but is a hard-won recognition of their real character. They were the great protesters. They protested against magic and sorcery, that is, against the superstition of a materialistic spiritism, against the popular morals of the time, against the popular cult, against the popular eschatology and most important of all, though it has been largely overlooked, *against the popular political nationalism which is implied in that eschatology.* In these respects their message still claims attention. In fact, none is more sorely needed at the present time. And among all who first proclaimed this message Isaiah is the chief.

188 Cf. also Sellin, p. 189.

189 This possibility Sellin pays no attention to on p. 189 or 191, where he rejects Gressmann's theory of two migrations.

190 *Die Profeten*, p. 204.

THE ORIGIN OF JEWISH ESCHATOLOGY

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

ESCHATOLOGY is the doctrine concerning the last things (τὰ ἔσχατα, *novissima*, האחרית). It deals with man's condition after death, the destiny of nations, and the end of the world. The Oxford dictionary defines it as "the department of theological science concerned with 'the four last things': death, judgment, heaven and hell". This is obviously too narrow a definition. In so far as eschatology has to do with religious ideas it is, indeed, a part of theology. But even without religious stimulus man's mind projects itself into the future as well as into the past. His scientific study of nature and his philosophy are as likely as his religion to occupy themselves with things to come. In the field of religious eschatology there are more things than the four mentioned. Even in Jewish and Christian eschatological thought, a place should be given to such conceptions as the Messiah, the kingdom of heaven on earth, the intermediate state, the resurrection, the destruction of the world, the new heaven and the new earth. The sharp distinction between eschatology and messianism drawn by Hermann Cohen[1] cannot be maintained; and the last things on earth can surely not be left out. Other ideas are found in the eschatology of other religions. Hugo Gressmann[2] confines eschatology to the complex of ideas connected with the end of the world and the renovation of the world, excluding in principle all that concerns "death

[1] *Die Religion der Vernunft*, 1921. Cp. my observations on this important posthumous work in The Philosophical Review, Jan. 1922, pp. 68 ff.

[2] *Der Ursprung der israelitisch-jüdischen Eschatologie*, 1905.

and resurrection, in short the final destiny of the individual" Such limitations do not seem justified either by etymology or usage.

But attention had been too exclusively given to the fate of the individual. Even on the lower stages of religious development speculation upon things to come is not wholly limited to man's condition after death. The shifting fortunes of war and the varying success in obtaining supplies give rise to anxious or hopeful thoughts of what may befall the tribe. Devastating floods, fires, cyclones, earthquakes, or volcanic eruptions, and terror-inspiring eclipses of the heavenly bodies suggest the possibility of a destruction of the world. But the higher forms of eschatological thought presuppose a more complex social organization and a closer observation of natural phenomena. Hope of deliverance from foreign oppression is keenest where it springs from a proud and outraged national consciousness, kept alive by the memory of past greatness; and dreams of empire are born of the example set by mighty conquerors and rulers holding peoples in subjection. It is especially myths of astrological origin that furnish material for strongly developed eschatologies. Only prolonged observation of the movements of the planets and the sun's course through the signs of the zodiac can render possible the thought of a recurrence at the end of the present period of the events connected with the world's origin, and the renovation of the world after its destruction. Eschatology clearly develops with the growth of man's intellectual and moral perceptions, his larger social experience, and his expanding knowledge of nature. While there is a general similarity, the outward forms vary with the character of the environment and the peculiar genius of each people. Ideas, like commodities and fashions, pass from land to land, but if the native soil can produce them a foreign origin must not too hastily be assumed.

These general considerations should be borne in mind in approaching the subject of Jewish eschatology. No one questions that our extant literature reveals a marked difference between earlier and later ideas in respect of man's condition after death, Israel's destiny, and the future of the world. The

great prophets of the Assyrian and Chaldaean periods stand forth in striking contrast with their predecessors and their successors in the Persian and the Graeco-Roman periods. Their tremendous emphasis upon the ethical demands of Yahwe and their opposition to chauvinism and entangling foreign alliances have set them apart and given them an epoch-making significance. It is not strange, therefore, that modern interpreters have been inclined to look upon them chiefly as moral teachers and to overlook the fact that they also were soothsayers and politicians. Their eyes were always turned toward the future, endeavoring to discern what Yahwe was about to do in the earth, and watching with anxiety the fulfilment of their prognostications of coming events. They took part in the raging political party strife of their day, if not with violent acts, as some who had gone before them, at least with fierce denunciations and strong intimidations. But they were powerful personalities, straightforward, fearless, and consistent. This has led many investigators of the books ascribed to them to regard as interpolations and additions sections that appeared to be out of harmony with their distinctive style, their characteristic cast of thought, and the historic situation that confronted them, and especially to athetize passages containing eschatological ideas foreign to the general tone and tenor of their oracles and known to have flourished in much later times. These passages have to do, not with the future of the individual, for on this point even the supposed interpolators, with one single exception (Isa. 26 19), still maintained the older view, but with the future of Israel and of the world.

Against this critical treatment a reaction has recently set in, led by Gunkel, Eichhorn, Gressmann, Bousset, and to some extent Bertholet, Kittel and others. Having discovered in the Hebrew Bible numerous unmistakable allusions to myths apparently of Babylonian origin, in addition to those already recognized as such, Hermann Gunkel[3] began to question the current explanation of certain peculiar expressions as merely figures of speech and to reject the *zeitgeschichtliche Methode*,

[3] *Schöpfung und Chaos*, 1895.

as Auberlen[4] had called it, that sees in many of them cryptic references to historic personalities. Suggestions in this direction were also made in academic lectures by that brilliant teacher, Albert Eichhorn. The same tendency was followed by Wilhelm Bousset,[5] though somewhat more guardedly and with stronger emphasis on possible Persian influence. Besides extending this manner of approach to many of the major problems of Old Testament exegesis, Hugo Gressmann[6] finally formulated a new theory and presented it in a work characterized by great learning, much ingenuity, and often rare insight. Briefly outlined, the theory is this. Long before the time of Amos many myths of foreign origin had found their way into Israel and Judah and attached themselves to the thought of Yahwe and his dealings with his people, the other nations, and the world. Most important among these was the conception of a coming destruction of the world by fire, preceded by an accumulation of plagues, and followed by a renewal of the world and the return of the terrestrial paradise, with its innocence and blessedness, ruled over by a semi-divine being, the first man. This idea probably originated in Persia, came through Elam (possibly as early as 2000 B. C.) to Babylonia, and then traveled with the Amorites to Palestine, where it had already been saturated with the Jewish spirit in the eighth century B. C. The great prophets applied the myth of the cosmic catastrophe locally, but because of their moral earnestness suppressed the supplementary myth of the cosmic restoration, except that in some passages they made concessions to the popular eschatology. The allusions in these passages cannot be understood unless one bears in mind the original myth. In the Graeco-Roman period this ancient mythical material was again utilized by the apocalyptic seers, and fresh accessions from abroad made it possible for them to rear a more elaborate structure.

A few typical illustrations must suffice to show the method of interpretation and the somewhat startling results. In Amos 5 18 the prophet declares: "Ah! ye who wish for the day of Yahwe!

[4] *Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenbarung Johannis*, 1854.

[5] *Die Religion des Judentums*, 1903, 1906[2]; *Die jüdische Apokalyptik*, 1903.

[6] *l. c.*

Wherefore would ye have the day of Yahwe? It will be darkness, and not light". Zephaniah says (1 18): "their silver and their gold cannot save them on the day of Yahwe's wrath, when all the land will be consumed by the fire of his anger; for he shall make a terrible end of all that dwell in the land". The conclusion is drawn that "the day of Yahwe" was a technical term popularly understood to mean both the end of the world through fire and its restoration, bringing in the golden age, but that the people generally expected to escape from the conflagration and share in the good time to come, while the prophets were unwilling to hold out any such hope. The thought of this day of Yahwe is supposed to be of foreign origin. So also the idea of a "Remnant", which did not originate with Isaiah. The enemy from the north in Jeremiah and Zephaniah is not a definite people expected to come upon Judah from that direction, neither the Scythian nor the Chaldaean, but a mysterious being connected with the mountain of the gods in the north. "So gut der Nordberg gleich dem Götterberge ist, so gut ist der Nördliche ein göttliches Wesen" (p. 190): and so is also the king of the north in Dan. 11 40 ff., whom Porphyrius and others have identified with Antiochus IV Epiphanes. It is thought that an Israelitish origin for this divine being is excluded, "since it has for its foundation polytheism".

The child called Immanuel in Is. 7 grows up in a land where the people live on milk and honey. These are imported products. Palestine was not a land literally flowing with milk and honey. They are "Götterspeise" and belong to the land of the gods. Immanuel is a mythical figure. The divine mother was probably originally Ishtar, not Damkina or Hathor. The hero expected by Isaiah (9 1-6) is a human king and a god, a kind of "Halbgott". The mythical epithets point to Egypt where they are common in the royal protocols (p. 282). The court style used in reference to the reigning prince as well as the eschatological king could not have been invented in a small kingdom, but must have come from a world-power. In some of the Servant of Yahwe Songs, found in the appendix to the book of Isaiah, we have remains of a cult-song, referring originally to the death and resurrection of a god, probably

Hadad-Rimmon or Tammuz-Adonis. In some passages these reminiscences from a pagan cult are applied to the people of Israel. Like the mother of the Messiah, the Messiah himself is of foreign origin. The figure of a divine king could only be based on the apotheosis of kings, not found in Israel, but among its neighbours. "One like a man" (כבר אנש) in Dan. 7 13 is not Michael, the guardian angel of the people to whom the kingdom is to be given, as I endeavoured to show in a paper read before this Society,[7] but the highest angel, a semi-divine being, known as "the man", an abbreviation of "the first man", the king of paradise, originally a foreign god, possibly the Persian Gayōmarṭ (Bousset), but more likely some divinity surviving as an aeon in Gnostic speculation. This non-Jewish figure traveled to Palestine for the first time long before the days of Amos and Hosea, and a second time shortly before the Christian era.

Criticism in detail is not possible within the limits of this paper. A few suggestions, however, may be offered. There is no room for doubt that myths of Sumerian, Akkadian, Arrapachitian, Amoritish, Aramaean, Canaanitish, Hittite, Egyptian, Cretan, and Assyrian origin found their way into Palestine and may have become known in Israel and Judah. This must certainly be the case with the stories concerning the creation of the world and primeval times. Nor can it be questioned that the rich development of eschatology in the Hasmonaean and Roman periods was influenced by Persian and Greek speculation. But the assumption of a foreign origin whenever a peculiar looking conception presents itself may easily become an obsession. Real evidence of advanced eschatological thought outside of Israel in the early times contemplated by the theory does not yet exist, or is at least extremely rare. Gunkel[8] rightly observes: "Aus der Beobachtung der Präcession der Sonne erklärt sich . . . die Gleichung von Urzeit und Endzeit, die in der Eschatologie eine solche Rolle spielt". It is quite uncertain, however, how early observers in Babylonia were able

[7] JBL, XIX, 1900, pp. 22 ff.

[8] *Genesis*,[2] p. 234.

to compute, even roughly, the precession of the equinoxes and consequently the cosmic year. Eduard Meyer[9] ascribes the division of the equator and the ecliptic into 360 degrees, and of the latter into the twelve signs of the zodiac, to the Chaldaeans in the first millennium B. C. and the more important progress in astronomy as well as astrology among them to the time of the Chaldaean Kingdom and the Achaemenian and Seleucid dynasties. According to Seneca,[10] Berosus maintained that "the world will burn when all the planets that now move in different courses come together in the Crab, so that they all stand in a straight line in the same sign, and the future flood will take place when the same conjunction occurs in Capricorn". How much older this conception is than the third century B. C. we cannot tell. If the idea of the cosmic catastrophe and the restoration of the world came from Persia, we have absolutely no datable documents to show when it first appeared there. Nor is there any evidence of its presence in Elamitic inscriptions or any indication of what could be identified as Persian influence in Elam in the remote period suggested.

The prophetic texts thus far discovered in Egypt do not show any idea of the destruction of the world through fire or reconstruction after such a catastrophe. They are important, however, because they clearly reveal the tendency of putting on the lips of ancient seers prophecies of historic events known to the real authors and of interpolating earlier texts, and also because the descriptions of present misery and future prosperity, in spite of the "Lust am Fabulieren" so characteristic of the Egyptians, keep within such modest bounds. A priest in the time of Snefru is credited with having predicted the coming of Ameni, probably Amenemhat I, and his successful reign, in a Petrograd papyrus and a wooden tablet at Cairo from the eighteenth dynasty. A demotic papyrus from the year 7 A. D. tells of the prophecies of calamity and Assyrian conquests uttered by a lamb in the 6th year of Bocchoris (c. 730 B. C.). The fragment of a Greek papyrus from the third century

[9] *Geschichte des Altertums*, I[3], 1913, pp. 591 ff.
[10] *Quaestiones naturales*, III, 29.

A. D. apparently contains a translation of a defense made before a king Amenophis by a potter accused of godlessness, who turns prophet, predicts disasters for Egypt, and then suddenly dies. Unless the whole production is very late, there is an interpolation threatening "the city on the sea"—as the reference to Agathos Daemon shows, clearly Alexandria—with so complete a destruction that fishermen will dry their nets where it once stood. It goes on to foretell the coming of a king from the east, set up by Isis, in whose reign there will be such blessedness that those who survive into that period will wish the dead to rise in order to share their joy. The time is obviously approaching when the movable year will coincide with the fixed year, the end of a Sothis-period in 139 A. D. One is tempted to think of a Jewish hand retouching an older text in the reign of Hadrian, or that of a native Egyptian having some familiarity with Jewish ideas and phraseology. "The Admonitions of Ipuwer", in a Leiden papyrus, though supposed by Lange, Breasted, and Eduard Meyer to contain "messianic" elements, do not seem to refer to the future at all, as Gardiner and Gressmann[11] have recognized. It is indeed astonishing that so few analogies to Jewish eschatological ideas have yet been found. It may be confidently expected that more will be discovered in course of time, giving a firmer foundation for theories of foreign influence, even where they seem today quite plausible.

There is no logical necessity for supposing that the notion of a destruction of the world through fire and a new creation, admittedly based on very advanced astronomical knowledge, must have preceded the simpler thought of local catastrophes. The more clearly it is perceived that Yahwe was regarded as manifesting himself in the earthquake, the cyclone, the volcanic eruption, the shirokko, the fire from heaven, and the pestilence, the more natural it is to assume that such plagues were expected as punishments for sin, whether alone or in groups, long before they were looked upon as signs of an impending cosmic conflagration. Similarly, the blessings of

[11] *Altorientalische Texte und Bilder*, 1909, p. 210.

Yahwe, abundant harvests, plenty of flocks and herds, security against wild beasts, victories in war, rich booty, health, longevity and numerous progeny, would be expected as gracious rewards long before they were thought of in connection with a restoration of the world after a cosmic conflagration and a return of the terrestrial paradise. The day of Yahwe looked for by the contemporaries of Amos may very well have been a day of victory and consequent prosperity, and the day of wrath, that fearful day, with which an Amos and a Zephaniah threatened the people, need be no more than a day of terrible defeat at the hands of foreign foes. If Yahwe afflicts them, not only with war, but with all its hellish train, and hurls at them the plagues that are his ancient agencies, this does not necessarily imply that he destroys the whole universe. There is no hint before Isaiah, either in Judah or among the other nations, of a mythical Remnant. His expectation that only few Judaeans would survive the devastating judgment to turn to Yahwe, as those who perished failed to do, does not necessarily suggest an already extant eschatological conception, nor a return from exile, nor the salvation of the elect.

It is perfectly natural that Jeremiah should have interpreted his vision of the seething caldron as indicating the coming of an enemy from the north, that he should have been ignorant of the name of the Scythians approaching from that direction, of their alliance with Assyria, and of their purpose to attack Egypt rather than the Assyrian vassal-state, Judah, and that he should have been convinced that Yahwe was watching over the oracle he had given to fulfil it, and therefore applied it later to the Chaldaeans. Nowhere, except in the thought of Jeremiah and Zephaniah, is there an indication of any such northern enemy. The court-style, which has been so illuminatingly described by Gressmann, may indeed have been in part borrowed. But the modesty of small courts can scarcely be urged against Jewish originality. Isaiah may certainly have expected that a young woman looking forward to motherhood would call a son Immanuel, with the easy confidence which the overthrow of Damascus and Samaria would inspire, and that an Assyrian invasion would soon work such havoc in Judah

that a limited amount of milk and honey would suffice for the few survivors in a land reduced to a desert. Of a mother-goddess there is not the slightest suggestion; and though Palestine may not literally be flowing with milk and honey, this diet would not have to be imported from the land of the gods. A shoot springing up from the root of Jesse obviously presupposes the fall of the Davidic dynasty and the birth of a scion of the old royal family on which the legitimatist hope centered. Whether a "Götterkind" or not, it is not necessary to think that the dominion would rest on his shoulders before he had grown up. That the singer of the Servant of Yahwe, even in some passages, drew upon a cult-song, celebrating the death and resurrection of a foreign deity, seems an unnecessary hypothesis, however ingenious it may be. Semites love to represent nations as individuals; and the death and quickening to new life of a nation is a figure of speech that does not necessarily imply complete extinction and an absolutely new creation. If the resurrection had not been barred out from the eschatological scheme, one would not have been startled to find the bones in Ezekiel's valley interpreted as the *disjecta membra* of a god, possibly Osiris.

Seeing that the everlasting kingdom is to be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, or the exalted saints (קדישי עליונין), the angelic nation, (and Gressmann himself admits that the one like a man in Dan. 7 13, as everywhere else in the book, is an angel), there appears to be no good reason why we should not regard Michael, the guardian angel of his people, as the highest of the angels. That he fights with the guardian angels and former gods of the world-powers does not militate against but rather strengthens this conclusion. He may indeed have been a god originally, as Gressmann thinks, and I suggested long ago. He was in course of time merged with the Messiah. No evidence has been brought forward to prove Gressmann's assertion that the Messiah was once a foreign god (p. 282). The hope of an Anointed One, either a righteous and victorious king who shall be a genuine descendant of David, as in the Psalms of Solomon, or a high-priestly ruler "of Aaron and Israel", as in the Zadokite

documents, is altogether explicable as a native growth. Neither in Daniel, nor in the Parables of Enoch, nor in Baruch, nor in IV Ezra can the original בר נשא "the man" have been a *title* of either the angel or the Messiah. No arguments urged from any side—and they have all been carefully considered—have changed my conviction as to the essential soundness of the position laid down for the first time in a paper presented to this Society twenty-seven years ago[12] both as to the employment of the term בר נשא in the original Aramaic texts of these apocalypses and as to its use by Jesus. Especially Grotius, Lagarde, Arnold Meyer and Eerdmans had paved the way. The same conclusions were reached independently, though published later, by Lietzmann; and they subsequently met with the approval of Wellhausen. In various publications[13] I have continued the discussion, dealing with such objections as have been made. It has more recently been suggested that Jesus may have used the term בן אדם; this seems to be precluded by the definite article before the genitive in the Greek which evidently seeks to render very literally the Aramaic phrase, just as the Aramaic versions by their ברה דאנשא, ברה דנברא, and ברה דבר נשא seek to render word for word the Greek. Dalman[14] recognizes that בר נשא was used by Jesus, and that it was not a messianic title. He thinks that אנש rather than בר אנש, was used in Galilean Aramaic in the first century A. D. It is not impossible that one was used more frequently than the other, though in the absence of texts from that century it cannot be proved. His strange conjecture that, when it actually was employed at that time, as by Jesus, it was not understood, and not intended to be understood, in the sense it always has wherever it occurs in any of the Aramaic dialects certainly lacks all plausibility. In regard to the later apocalypses there is still too much confidence in the integrity and accuracy of late versions, themselves sometimes made from translations. This is not to be wondered at, when even in the interpretation of the prophetic books the simple duty is

[12] Published in JBL, XV, 1896, pp. 36 ff.

[13] *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, 1903; *The Prophet of Nazareth*, 1905, etc.

[14] *Die Worte Jesu*, 1898.

neglected of comparing long-suspected passages with those that are all but universally recognized as genuine. It is too late to question that much mythical material of foreign origin was taken into the thought of Israel and adopted by its own religious genius, and there is no disposition to undervalue the real services rendered by scholars like Gunkel and Gressmann in detecting such alien elements. But some considerations are often overlooked. Before the prophets, and in spite of them, polytheism flourished in Israel; and there were native myths as well as foreign. Myths are what men say about the gods. What are the stories told about Yahwe himself but myths? Concerning the so-called "schools of the prophets" we know next to nothing. If the stories of Elijah and Elisha come from these "sons of the prophets", they reveal little that can be traced to a foreign origin, but have many mythical as well as legendary features. On the other hand, there is a tendency to underestimate the creative power and originality of the great prophets and of those who struggled with the problems of thought under the mighty ethical impulse they had given. In respect of man's condition after death the adoption of the Persian doctrine of a resurrection seems to have been prepared, not only by the belief that Yahwe had taken certain heroes directly up to heaven and brought others back from Sheol by empowering his prophets to raise them from the dead, but also by peculiar moral considerations. While Job himself resolutely brushes aside "the hope of man", he touches with infinite pathos upon the longing of the creator for the work of his hands that might lead him to call this creature back from Sheol into life. In the struggle for monotheism the simple explanation, in the appendix to Isaiah, that the other gods were simply stocks and stones did not satisfy. They were thought of as living beings reduced from their divine rank to be angels, among whom Yahwe must reign and rebellion be quelled. Thus justice was extended to the invisible world, and the way was paved for heaven and hell. In annotations to the prophecies against foreign nations, the idea of a return from exile was applied to some of them, and places of honor were given even to enemy nations by the side of Israel. When

the notion of a cosmic conflagration and a following restoration, an אחרית corresponding to the ראשית, appears in tangible form, the dominant note is the hope of a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. This ethical motivation is of the greatest importance.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE ATTITUDE OF THE SYNAGOGUE TOWARDS THE APOCALYPTIC-ESCHATOLOGICAL WRITINGS

LOUIS GINZBERG
JEWISH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF AMERICA

THE attractiveness of the novel is responsible not only for the lively interest in the Apocalyptic-eschatological literature noticeable among all students of the origins of Christianity, but also for the exaggerated claims advanced by some scholars for these literary productions of a handful of Jewish visionaries. Many an apocalypse has been discovered or made accessible only in recent times and scholars are human enough to be dazzled by sudden light. A picture drawn by artificial light will never be true to nature, great as the skill of the artist may be, and hence the failure of some really great scholars to give us a true picture of the religious life of Israel at the time of the rise of Christianity. A history of Judaism based on the Pseudepigrapha and particularly the visions of the apocalypses could but be a visionary pseudo-history. It would, however, be impossible within the compass of anything less than a substantial volume to present an adequate criticism of the view which sees in the so-called popular literature of the Jews the true mirror of the religion of the Jewish people. In the following few remarks I intend to give some facts about the attitude of the Synagogue towards the apocalyptic writings which I hope may throw some light on the very intricate problems connected with the eschatological doctrines and beliefs of the Jews at the time of the Apostles and Apostolic Fathers.

It is a well-known fact that none of the apocalyptic books with the exception of Daniel was received by the Synagogue.[1] The preservation of this literature is exclusively due to the efforts of the early Church. With equal certainty one may state that there is not one quotation from the now extant apocalyptic writings in the vast Rabbinic literature extending over the first six centuries of the common era. One might cite numerous parallels to the statements, legends or phrases of the apocalyptic authors from the Rabbinic writings, but these parallels are never of a nature that would indicate a literary dependence of the one kind of literature upon the other. This is best proved by the fact that the Rabbis never mention by name any apocalyptic writing. It is true Dr. Kohler (J. Q. R. V., pp. 400—401) finds in an ancient Tannaitic tradition a direct reference to the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. Not having however the vision of an apocalyptic writer I fail to detect in the passages indicated by Dr. Kohler the slightest reference to the Testaments. The assertion of Dr. Kohler is based on an arbitrarily construed text and on the impossible translation thereof. He quotes from the Talmud the text dealing with the nature of the admonition addressed by the court to the woman suspected of adultery; the text as given by Dr. Kohler reads:

דברי הגדה מעשים שאירעו בכתובים הראשונים
כגון מעשה ראובן בבלהה ומעשה יהודה בתמר אשר חכמים יגידו
אלו ראובן ויהודה

The translation of this text by Dr. Kohler is: Words of the Haggadah, historical facts which occur in the early writings as the story of Reuben regarding Bilhah and of Judah regarding Tamar, as it says in Job XV. 18 "The wise ones confess and conceal it not; these are Reuben and Judah." The early writings, according to Dr. Kohler, are the Testaments where the confessions of Reuben and Judah are found. We thus learn from this tradition of the Tannaim the very interesting fact that one of the apocalypses at least, for some time, enjoyed almost canonical dignity among the Rabbis. Before giving the true text

[1] The apocalyptic literature of the Gaonic period is neither in form nor in matter a direct development of the pre-Talmudic Apocalypse.

as found in the Rabbinic sources I want to call attention to the very strange translation[2] by Dr. Kohler of the imaginary one. Misled by the English expression "occur in a book" he renders שאירעו בכתובים by "which occur in the writings". But ארע ב׳ has never any other meaning than "it happened to"—generally something evil or unpleasant[3]—and accordingly our text would speak of something that happened to the ancient writings!

Dr. Kohler, though giving three sources for the text quoted did not state that in none of them "his" text is found.[4] Sifre, Numbers 12 has not the sentence from מעשה to בתמר; after כגון follows the quotation from Job;[5] in Babli, Sotah 7b where this sentence is found it follows after the quotation from Job, while in Yerushalmi, Sotah I, 16b the text begins with כגון as a comment upon the words of the Mishna I, 4 and hence may entirely be ignored in the discussion of the meaning of כתובים הראש׳ found in the two other sources. The text as given in Sifre and Babli admits two explanations. דברי הגדה ומעשים may be taken as ἓν διὰ δυοῖν, the Haggadah concerning the events that happened and כתובים הראשונים stands for Job which, according to the Rabbis, is the third[6] in the order of the eleven Hagiographa. The passage is consequently to be rendered: "The

[2] Dr. Charles, who, in the introduction to his translations of the Testaments, quotes Dr. Kohler's view with approval very likely did not take the trouble to look up the passages quoted by him.

[3] The "happenings" consequently refer to the sins and not the confessions; why then quote the Testaments and not Genesis?

[4] The text given by Dr. Kohler is that emended by Guedemann, *Zunz — Jubelschrift*, 116, in accordance with his view that Haggadah means "story". Bacher, *Tannaiten*, II. 451, has disposed of the "story" and also of the emendation.

[5] In Sifre מעשים without ו, which is probably due to some "learned" copyist who omitted this letter on account of his inability to explain the construction of the sentence. The reading with ו as given in the editions of Babli is found also in Rashi, *ad loc.*, Yalkut, I, 707, on Num. 5 15 (in the first edition: בכתובות comp. note 10), Ibn Masnut in his commentary on Job 15 18 and in the Munich Ms. of the Talmud.

[6] According to the Massorah the three first Hagiographa are "Psalms, Proverbs and Job", while the Tannaitic tradition in Baba Batra, 14b, gives the order as, "Ruth, Psalms and Job". Comp. also Berakot, 57b, beginning, "The three big Hagiographa—Psalms, Proverbs and Job".

Haggadah found in the first Hagiographa concerning the events that happened, for example: which wise men have told etc." The verse of Job is quite correctly described as a Haggadah on the narratives of Genesis about the sins of Reuben and Judah. The other explanation presupposes that the text of the Talmud though fuller than that of the Sifre is not quite complete, the words ומעשה דוד בבת שבע being omitted out of respect for the pious king. If this assumption be correct בכתובים הראשו׳ stand for the Pentateuch,[7] where the sins of Reuben and Judah are told and the Book of Samuel, where the story of David's sin is given. The woman is thus admonished to confession by the court who put before her in an elaborate way, or, as the Rabbis say, in Haggadic style, the events narrated in the earlier parts of Scripture, i. e. Genesis and Samuel.[8] The second explanation has much in its favour, especially as it does away with a very great difficulty. The incident of David with Bath-Sheba and the confession of his sin by the pious king is certainly the most natural thing that we would expect the court to dwell upon in addressing the woman suspected of adultery. The omission of the reference to David in our texts can easily be explained, as according to the regulations laid down in Mishnah, Megillah, end, the "story of David" is not to be read in the Synagogue and still less to be translated by the Meturgeman, while the "story of Reuben" may be read, though not translated, the "story of Judah" only is permitted to be read and translated.[9]

Attention should also be called to the fact that the text of Yerushalmi as given in Midrash Haggadol, Num. 5, 19 (in

[7] Rashi, *ad loc.*, understands בכתובים הר׳ to refer to the Pentateuch which however is very unlikely, as we certainly would expect בתורה, the usual term for this part of the Bible. Of course Rashi does not commit the error of making בכתובים dependent on שארעו but takes it to stand for שבכתובים which is quite possible.

[8] The order of the Prophets is, "Joshua, Judges, Samuel" (Baba Batra 14b) and it is quite natural to describe the first and fourth books of the Bible as the first writings.

[9] This is in accordance with the readings of the editions. See, however, *Variae Lectiones*, Megillah, 25 a, note 60. It is very likely that, according to the Mishnah, the paraphrase by the Meturgeman only was prohibited, while later this prohibition was extended to the reading too.

manuscript) has ומעשה אמנון באחותו after יהודה בתמר. This reading[10] can hardly be justified, as Amnon does not belong to the repentant sinners and it can be explained only by the assumption that the original reading was: מעשה ראובן ... בתמר ומעשה דוד בבת שבע as in Mishnah Megillah, end. When the reference to David was omitted the one concerning Amnon was substituted to make our Baraita agree as far as possible with the phraseology of the Mishnah. It may be mentioned in passing that the confessions of Reuben and Judah are a very favorite subject with the Tannaim and Amoraim, comp. e. g. Pesikta Buber XXV, 159a—159b, Sifre Deut. 348, Midrash Tannaim 214.

On כתובים as name for Pentateuch and Prophets comp. Blau, *Zur Einleitung*, p. 28sq. His explanation of the later use of the term כתובים = Hagiographa as an abbreviation of שאר כתובים is supported by the very same development of the use of ספרי "Sifre" from שאר ספרי דבי רב; comp. RSBM on Baba Batra 124b.[11]

The only quotation from an apocalypse in the Talmud[12] is found Sanhedrin 97b and reads: "Four thousand two hundred and ninety years after "creation" the world will become orphaned;[13] the wars of the dragons (תנינים, a mythological-eschatological word!) will then take place as well as the wars of Gog and Magog and after these events the days of the Messiah, but the renewal[14] of the world by God will take place after

10 Comp. Schechter in the introduction to his *Sectaries*, I, 27, note 65. The emendation לאבות הראשונים suggested by him is not acceptable. It is true אבות is sometimes applied to prominent men of biblical times (comp. Ginzberg, "*Eine Unbekannte Jüdische Sekte*", 295, note 2), but Amnon is certainly more of an infamous person than a famous one. In Yalkut ed. princeps בכתובות (comp. note 5) is a corruption of בכתובים, not of לאבות.

11 The objections raised by Hoffmann, *Zur Einleitung*, 40, note 1, against this explanation of R. S. B. M. are not very strong, but it would lead me too far to discuss them here.

12 Prof. Israel Levi, R. E. J. I, 108 seq. has collected a number of apocalyptic passages—but not all of them—found in the Talmud. His view, however, that they prove the composition of apocalyptic writings by the Amoraim is far from convincing.

13 I. e. there will be no pious and good men left; comp. Mekilta, Bo 16, 18b, and parallel passages given by Friedmann.

14 חדש admits two meanings, "to renew" and "to create anew", comp. Ps. 51 12 where חדש is = ברא.

seven thousand years". This passage is quoted in the Talmud from a Scroll "written in Assyrian script (= square) and in Hebrew language" which a Jewish soldier is said to have found about 300 C. E. in the archives of Rome.

The description of this apocalyptic Scroll as having been "written in Assyrian script and in Hebrew language" is very interesting. What is meant by this characterization of the apocalyptic writing is that it had the make-up of a Biblical book. Scripture defiles the hands only when written in Hebrew language and in Assyrian script (Yadaim IV, 5), and similarly the scroll of Esther used for public reading on the feast of Purim had to be written in the same way, comp. Megillah I, 8; II, 1. The claim made accordingly for the apocalyptic scroll was that it was, if not of a canonical, at least of semi-canonical character, written for the purpose of public reading and study. The question whether this claim was justified does not need to detain us since we know nothing about its merits. It is, however, very significant that as late as the fourth century such a claim could be raised for a non-canonical book.

This leads us to the very crucial question: did the Synagogue at some time or another, at the joint conference of the schools of Shammai and Hillel about 66 C. E., or later in Jabne about 120,[15] take steps to prohibit the reading of the Pseudepigrapha and particularly the Apocalypses. This is not the place to discuss the difficult problems connected with the history of the Canon, but it is evident that we shall never understand the attitude of the Synagogue towards these "outside writings" as long as we do not know what the Tannaim have to say on this subject. The very learned and stimulating essay by Professor George F. Moore "The Definition of the Jewish Canon and the Repudiation of Christian Scriptures"[16] represents the last word of Biblical scholarship on the final delineation of the Canon. I regret however that I cannot accept the conclusion which this distinguished scholar has reached.

The result of the thorough examination by Prof. Moore of

[15] Comp. Graetz, *Kohelet* 166 seq.

[16] Published in "*Essays in Modern Theology and Related Subjects*", N. Y., 1911.

the Tannaitic sources bearing upon this question may be briefly summed up as follows: The ספרים החיצונים the reading of which is strongly condemned[17] by Rabbi Akiba, Sanhedrin X, 1 refer to the heretical, in particular to the early Christian writings. The ספרי המירס spoken of by Rabban Johanan ben Zakkai, Yaddaim IV, 6 in connection with the defilement of the hands and the reading of which books is permitted in Yerushalmi, Sanhedrin X, 28a owe their existence to a scribal error; המירס is nothing but a corruption of המינים. Consequently the text of Yerushalmi is to be emended to read as follows: הקורא בספרים החיצונים כגון ספרי בן לענה וספרי המינים אבל ספרי בן סירא וגו׳. The translation of this passage as given by Prof. Moore reads: "He who reads in the arch-heretical books, such as the books of Ben-Laana (Gospels)[18] and the books of the heretics (Christians).

[17] The words of R. Akiba are "Also he who reads in the outside books has no share in the world to come". It may not be out of place to remark that the rabbis were often in the habit of using emphatic language. That the losing of the share in the world to come is not always to be taken literally can easily be seen from the remark, Abot R. Nathan, XXXVI, 108, about the seven professions—very honorable ones—whose members are declared to forfeit their share in the world to come; comp. also, *ibid.* XXVII.

[18] The reading Laana is very doubtful. The only MS. of this part of the Yerushalmi has לענא (comp. Ginzberg, *Yerushalmi Fragments*, 262) and this is very likely the correct reading, as Kohelet R. XII, 12, in a passage undoubtedly dependent on Yerushalmi has תנלא and this is much nearer to לענא than to לענה of the editions. The identification of Laana with Jesus by Prof. Moore is neither better nor worse than the half dozen other identifications of this name recorded by me in *Jewish Encyclopedia*, s. v. Ben Laana. When, however, Prof. Moore, in support of his identification, points to another nickname for Jesus found in the Mishnah I must say with the Rabbis of old: "An error once entered remains." A Babylonian Amora in the second half of the third century, who very likely never in his life saw a Christian nor knew anything about Christianity had the ingenuity to find in בן סטרא—a sorcerer mentioned in the Tannaitic source, Tosefta Shabbat, XI, 15—a nickname for Jesus. The identification is not only without any sound basis, but hardly possible, as has been conclusively shown by Derenbourg, *Essai*, 460 seq. and especially Chajes in the Hebrew periodical, Ha-Goren, IV, 33–37. The hunt for nicknames, however, continues merrily and soberminded scholars speak seriously of Balaam, Doeg, Ahitophel, and Gehazi as being the nicknames which the Mishnah Sanhedrin, X, 1, uses for Jesus and three

But as for the books of Ben-Sira and all books that have been written since his time, he who reads in them is as one who reads in a letter". The inference which Prof. Moore draws from these premises is that the attempt authoritatively to define the Canon of the Hagiographa was dictated by the danger that threatened the Synagogue from the circulation among Jews of the Gospels and other Christian books.

Personally I am firmly convinced that there never was a time when the Synagogue had to carry on a fight against the canonicity of the Gospels,[19] but, as this is rather a matter which

of his disciples. If these scholars were consistent they ought to try to identify the three kings—Jeroboam, Ahab, and Manasseh—with three Christian emperors, since the four "private persons" mentioned and the "three kings" are said in the Mishnah to form one class of grave sinners. What a pity that there were no Christian emperors at the time of the Mishnah! Numerous legends concerning these seven sinners are given in both Talmuds in connection with the statement of the Mishnah concerning them, and these legends can by no stretch of imagination be made to apply to other persons than to those who bear these names in the Bible. They show not only how the Amoraim understood this statement of the Mishnah, but also how much the lives of these Biblical persons occupied the fancy of the Jewish people. One may therefore state with absolute certainty that the entire Talmudic-Midrashic literature does not know of any nicknames for Jesus or his disciples. I may add that גליונים = *εὐαγγέλιον* must not be taken as a mutilation or perversion, but is a very common form of apheresis, comp. the remark on page 128 about מירום = Homer. By the way, if Ben Laana is a nickname for Jesus why not take it as an equivalent for בן מרים, the son of Miriam? According to the Rabbis, the name Miriam denotes "bitterness" (Seder Olam R., III, and the parallel passages given by Ratner), and לענה "wormwood" is used in Hebrew to describe something very bitter. Of course I do not consider this etymology seriously. Jesus is never named in old sources otherwise than יהושע, ישו, ישוע or Jesus the son of Pantera. Origen. *C. Cels.* I, 70, shows that Pantera (= פנתירא i. e. *πάνθηρ*) is a real name and not a nickname.

[19] The passage Tosefta Yadaim, III, 4, "The Gospels and the other heretical books do not defile the hands" has been frequently misunderstood. The defiling of the hands by a book being equal to our way of saying that such a book is canonical, this statement of the Tosefta was taken to mean that it needed a special ruling to declare these books as non-canonical. The truth of the matter, however, is, that the Halakah had to consider the possibility of the defilement by these books not on

can neither be proved nor disproved, I shall limit myself to an examination of the premises which led Prof. Moore to his conclusions. I fully agree with the view which finds in the Mishna Sanhedrin a statement by R. Akiba directed against Christians. The severe condemnation by Rabbi Akiba of the use of Exodus 15 26 in connection with medication is certainly directed against certain Christian healers,[20] as has been felt by many scholars, though they were unable to explain why just this Biblical verse was so opprobrious to the Rabbis. The answer to this question is very simple. The last three words of this verse אני יהוה רפאך have the same numerical value (three hundred eighty eight plus three for the three words = three hundred ninety one) as the name of Jesus (ישוע = three hundred ninety one). It is not unlikely that some crypto-Christians who were afraid to openly perform

account of their own merits but because of the numerous quotations from Scriptures they contain. This paragraph of the Tosefta is, as one easily sees, not a comment upon Mishnah Yad. IV, 6, where the defilement by Scripture is discussed between Rabban Johanan ben Zakkai and the Sadducees, but on Yad. III, 5, where the law is laid down that even a very small fragment of a canonical book defiles the hands. In view of this ruling the question had to be discussed what to do with those heretical writings containing copious quotations from Scriptures. The final decision was that even the most extensive quotations from Scripture lose their holy quality if embedded in an heretical writing or in a prayer book; prayers should not be written down, but recited by heart. The far fetched interpretation of גליונים in Tosefta as "margins" given in Shabbat 116a shows rather the acquaintance of the Babylonian Amoraim with the Gospels than their ignorance of the true meaning of גליונים = *εὐαγγέλιον*. They knew that there is no continuous quotation containing 85 letters from the Hebrew Bible in the Gospels, which number is the minimum of a fragment that might defile the hands. Accordingly the Amoraim found the statement concerning the Gospels, גליונים, given in Tosefta entirely superfluous, and solved the difficulty by explaining גליונים as margins. The Tosefta however either mentioned גליונים on account of the other heretical books with which the Gospels are ordinarily coupled together (and there very likely were heretical books that contained quotations from the Bible of more than 85 letters), or the Tosefta dates from a time when the minimum was less than 85 letters.

20 The magical averruncation mentioned in Tosefta Sanhedrin, XII, 10, and Abot R. Nathan, XXVI in connection with this mode of healing is said in Mark 7 33, 8 23, John 9 6, to have been employed by Jesus.

cures "in the name of Jesus" would use this verse in which they found his name indicated. Professor Moore, however, does injustice to the Rabbis when he maintains that they had no scruples about using verses of the Bible in connection with medication. The prohibition against "healing by the words of the Torah" is given in the Babylonian as well as in the Palestinian Talmud (comp. Shebuot 15b, Yerushalmi Shabbat VI, 8b), and the numerous magical formulas in the Talmudim, with one exception (Shabbat 67a, top), contain no Biblical verses. The very strong condemnation of the use of Exodus 15 26 cannot, however, be explained otherwise than on account of the favour this verse enjoyed among the Christian healers. But the coupling by R. Akiba of the prohibition against the outside books with that against the use of Exodus 15 26 as a charm does not indicate that both prohibitions are directed against Christians. Tosefta Sanhedrin XII, 10 and Aboth R. Nathan XXXVI, end, add another statement concerning the Canon by R. Akiba which by no stretch of imagination can be made to refer to some Christian heresy or practice. In these sources the man who sings the Song of Songs at festival gatherings—i. e. who treats this Biblical book as if it were of a secular character—is classed among those who have no share in the world to come. We know from many other places that Rabbi Akiba was the valiant champion of the canonicity of this Biblical book, but the opposition he had to combat he met among his own colleagues and friends.[21]

The meaning of חיצונים in the statement of Rabbi Akiba is the crucial point in the entire discussion. I shall therefore try to establish its true meaning. The word occurs nowhere else; Mishna Megillah IV, 8 דרך החיצון is in the correct reading[22] while החיצונים of the editions is undoubtedly due to החיצונים in R. Akiba's famous statement. The meaning of דרך החיצון is

[21] Comp. Yadaim, III, 5.

[22] This is the reading of Ms. Munich, Aruk s. v. אונקלי, Meïri, and R. Nissim Gerondi (*Jerusalem*, 1884) ad loc. Aruk s. v. חצון, agree with the editions, but this is certainly a copyist's error, since the explanation of the phrase given in this passage does not admit any other reading than that given in the first passage.

easily established if one considers it in connection with the expressions כשורה and לפנים משורת הדין. A correct action is כשורה, literally "according to the line"—of the law, לפנים משורת הדין "within the line" describes a pious action which the strict law does not directly command and accordingly דרך החיצון is "outside the line"—the exact regulation of the law.[23] To say with Prof. Moore that the term חיצונים is synonymous with מינים, but evidently carries a stronger reprobation, would be far from the mark, even if the reading החיצונים were the correct one. The covering of the phylacteries with gold[24] or putting them on the sleeve instead of on the bare arm is characterized as דרך החיצונים. Now, while these practices are not quite correct they are not at all a serious break of the Law, as pointed out by R. Nissim Gerondi in his commentary on *Al-Fasi* ad loc. and consequently, though censured as incorrect, are never said to be heretical. On the other hand, the putting of the phylacteries not on the part of the body prescribed for this practice is declared to be an outright heresy. If therefore the reading החיצונים in Megillah were correct it would furnish the strongest proof against taking החיצונים in Sanhedrin in the sense of heretics. Prof. Moore quotes Talmud Megillah 24b to the effect that the persons described as החיצונים in the Mishna are such as are suspected to be inoculated with heresy. The Talmud, however, offers no comment whatever on this part of the Mishnah. The words quoted from the Talmud by Prof. Moore refer to something entirely different. The Mishna *ibid.* reads: "He who says 'I refuse to step before the Tebah (perform the public service in the Synagogue) in coloured garments' is not permitted to do it in white gowns". The comment of the Talmud on this Mishnah is: Because we suspect that he is inoculated with heresy. Clemens Alexandrinus, *Instructor* II, 11, 12, as well as III, 11 likewise mentions the custom of the early Christians to dress in white, and consequently the heresy spoken of by the Talmud in

[23] Comp. Aruk, s. v. חצון whose words are: לא עבד כרין וכשורה.

[24] This custom reminds one of the use of chrysography for the divine names in the Holy Scrolls by the Alexandrian Jews, which was likewise censured by the Rabbis. Comp. Shabbat, 103 b, Masseket Soferim, I, 10.

this connection refers to Christianity.[25] Professor Moore quotes further the reading מינות הוגה חיצונה from the Munich manuscript which he renders by "heresy and extraneous speculation". No such reading is found there, nor does הוגה "speculation" occur anywhere else in the Rabbinic literature. The copyist of the MS. made a mistake and wrote מינות which word he had before him in the first clause of the Mishnah, but noticing his error he corrected it to חיצונה. Rabbinovicz, the author of *Variae Lectiones*, thus remarks: written מינות but "corrected" הוגָה to חיצונה. The photograph of this manuscript is before me and I find that this statement of Rabbinovicz is correct.

We may then state with certainty that there is no such word as חיצונים "heretics" in the entire Talmudic-Midrashic literature, and that judging by the use of the singular חיצון the plural חיצונים could not have been used in the sense supposed by Prof. Moore. But even granted the equation חיצונים=מינים, the expression ספרים החיצונים "heretical books" is hardly possible in Talmudic Hebrew. We have ספרי מינים "heretical books", ספרי קוסמים "magical books",[26] and consequently we would expect ספרי חיצונים the "books of the heretics" and not ספרים החיצונים as we have it in R. Akiba's Mishnah. It is true, the Babylonian Talmud, Sanhedrin 100b explains ספרים החיצונים by ספרי מינים "heretical books", but the Palestinian Talmud, Sanhedrin X, 28a, which is by far a safer guide in historical or linguistic matters than the Babli, quite explicitly states that Ben Sira is included among the ספרים החיצונים and thus clearly takes ס' החיצונים to mean books "outside of the Canon", though not of a heretical character. The attempt made by many scholars to reconstruct the text of Yerushalmi so as to agree with Babli is decidedly a vain effort. Before entering, however, upon the discussion of this point it is necessary to know what ס' המירס stand for in this passage of the Yerushalmi, as a good deal depends upon the correct understanding of this term.

Professor Moore gets rid of this inconvenient term by emending it to ס' מינים, but while there may be some doubt as to the

[25] Comp. also Goldfahn, Monatsschrift 1870, 174.
[26] Yerushalmi Maaserot, I, 51a.

exact meaning of this obscure word,[27] no doubt is possible as to its genuineness. Midrash Tehillim, I, 9 in commenting upon Ps. 19 15 remarks: David prayed to God that men may not read his words as they read the books of מירוס, but that they may read them and meditate[28] over them so that they receive reward for doing it as if they would study the most difficult parts of the Tora ואל יהו קורין בהם כקורין בספרי מירוס אלא יהו קורין בהם והוגין בהם ונוטלין עליהן שכר כנגעים ואהלות[29] וגו׳. It is evident that מירוס is the same as המירס in Yaddaim IV, 6 and in our passage of the Yerushalmi and that by it the Midrash understands books of a secular nature which one may read without doing damage to one's salvation though the reading is without spiritual benefit; one "reads them, but does not meditate or ponder over them". To make David pray that the Psalms may not be read by men "like heretical books" would be the height of absurdity. A careful reading of the Mishna Yaddaim leads to the same conclusion as to the meaning of ס׳ המירס. The books which according to Rabban Johanan ben Zakkai do not defile the hands "because they are not precious" can only be secular books but not heretical ones. The description of heretical books by the leader of the Pharisees as "not precious" would be as inept as such a characterization of the Thesis of Luther by the head of the *Index Expurgatorius*.

The earliest commentary on the Mishnah composed in the ninth or tenth century by one of the Babylonian Gaonim—perhaps Saadia[30]—takes המירס to be "Homer" and this is very likely the correct interpretation of this word. Of course, we

[27] There are numerous etymologies of this word; comp. Graetz, Monatsschrift, 1870, 139 seq., Perles R. E. J. III, 114, Weil, *ibid.* 278, Kohut, J. Q. R. III, 546, Kohler, *ibid.* V, 415, Jastrow, *Dictionary*, 355 b. Not one of these etymologies deserves serious consideration; on the traditional explanation of המירס = Homer see text.

[28] This passage shows conclusively that הגה is not "read" but "study" or "meditate", comp. note 40.

[29] These laws form a very difficult section of the Mishnah and hence are often used to describe the most important parts of the Halakah; comp. for instance Hagīgāh, 14 a.

[30] Comp. Ginzberg, *Geonica*, 172 seq. and Epstein, *Der Gaonäische Kommentar*, 29 seq.

must not think of a translation of Homer into Hebrew—the discussion about the "defiling of the hands" could only refer to Hebrew books—but the books of Homer[31] stand for "light literature", books one may read but which are "not precious". The apheresis of Greek loan words is quite common in Jewish writings and the forms מירוס and מירון (accusative!) offer no difficulty.[32] That some of the copyists who undoubtedly never had heard of Homer wrote המירם is not in the least surprising, if one considers that λῃστής "thief" is regularly mispelled as ליסטים, though its meaning must have been known as it occurs hundreds of times in the Talmudic-Midrashic literature.

We shall now proceed to examine the text of the Yerushalmi. We have seen that המירם must not be amended and that by it secular literature is meant, the reading of which is permitted in contrast to that of the Book of Ben Sira which is said to belong to the prohibited books. The question is of course very puzzling how to harmonize this interdict by Rabbi Akiba[33] with the fact that, of all the Apocrypha, Ben Sira is the only one quoted by the rabbis. A great Talmudist at the end of the sixteenth century[34] suggested the following emendation of the Yerushalmi: (r.: כגון ספרי המירם וספרי בן לענה אבל ספרי (ספר בן סירא וכל ספרים שנכתבו מיכן והילך הקורא בהן בקורא באיגרת. Among modern scholars it was Graetz (*Kohelet* 166) who

[31] In the Ms. of the Yerushalmi reproduced by me in *Yerushalmi Fragments*, 36 b, this word is vocalized as הוֹמִירם Homeras, comp. note 27.

[32] In Hullin, 60 b, two manuscripts have מירוס, Aruk מירון, מרון, המירוס and R. Samson of Sens, in his commentary on Yadaim, III, 5, מידם which is very likely a corruption of מירוס. The reading of the Editions ספרי מינים is quite impossible as no one would ever have dared to say that there are verses in Scripture which seem fit to be burned like heretical books. The names and histories of certain nations who lived in pre-Mosaic times mentioned in Genesis—these are the verses spoken of as the Talmud explicitly states—might be said to be superfluous, but certainly not heretical and deserving to be burned. The original reading was ס' [ה]מירוס "like story books" and as מירוס was later understood by many to mean heretical, a pious copyist added the words ראוין לישרף, and still later מינים was substituted for מירוס. Comp., however, Baba Batra 91 a.

[33] R. Akiba himself shows acquaintance with this book; comp. Graetz, *Gnosticismus*, 119, and Bacher, *Tannaiten*[2] I, 269, note 2.

[34] R. Issachar Baer Eulenburg in his *Novellae on Sanhedrin*, 100 b.

independently proposed the same emendation which was later accepted by Perles (R. E. J. III, 116), Joel (*Blicke* I, 75) and Professor Moore. I do not think however that this emendation is acceptable. The statement of R. Joseph, Sanhedrin 100b, that one is prohibited to read the book of Ben Sira is certainly based upon a Tannaitic tradition which counted Ben Sira among the prohibited books. In other words this Babylonian Amora, celebrated for his great knowledge of Tannaitic traditions (comp. Berakot 64a, Horayyot, end) agrees with the view given in our text of the Yerushalmi and it would therefore be against all canons of criticism to emend it against such high authority for its genuineness. It is true the discussion between R. Joseph and his pupil Abbay shows that even the master was unable to explain the reason of the interdict against the reading of Ben Sira and driven into a lurch he had to admit: Were it not for the prohibition against Ben Sira by the Rabbis we would lecture on the book.[35] This, however, corroborates our view that Rabbi Joseph was acquainted with the Tannaitic tradition that counted Ben Sira among the ס׳ החיצונים and *nolens volens* he had to submit to the authority of the Tannaim. He could not, of course, explain this Palestinian view which is based upon a different interpretation of ס׳ חיצונים from that prevailing in the Babylonian academies. The Babylonians identified ס׳ חיצונים with ס׳ מינים "heretical books" and Ben Sira could not well be described as heretical, while the Palestinian authorities correctly explain the term used by Rabbi Akiba as referring to "outside books" i. e. Apocrypha, especially those among them which were very popular, like Ben Sira.

The above quoted remark of Rabbi Joseph with regard to the use of Ben Sira in public lectures shows at the same time what is meant by the reading of the "outside books". Not the reading of the Apocrypha was prohibited by Rabbi Akiba, but their use in the Synagogues and houses of study for public service or instruction. More than twenty years ago I wrote: "Akiba protested strongly against the canonicity of certain of the Apocrypha, Ecclesiasticus for instance (Sanhedrin X, 1,

[35] The corruption of the text in the Editions is obvious. Read with R. Meir Abulafia, *ad loc.*: אי לאו דגנזוה רבנן להאי סיפרא הוה דרש׳ וגו׳.

Babli *ibid.* 100b, Yerushalmi *ibid.* X, 28a) in which passages קורא is to be explained according to Kiddushin 49a and חיצונים according to its Aramaic equivalent[36] ברייתא so that Akiba's utterance reads: "He who reads aloud in the Synagogue from books not belonging to the Canon as if they were canonical" etc. I have little to add to it, except that by reading aloud in the Synagogue I meant public study too and not liturgical recitation only. The objection raised by Prof. Moore against this interpretation of R. Akiba's statement can be easily refuted; he writes: "The principle, however, seems to have been early established that even the acknowledged Hagiographa should not be read in the Synagogue". But the very sources[37] quoted by him (Mishna, Shabbat XVI, 1 and Tosefta XIII, 1) show clearly that it needed a special ruling of the Rabbis to prohibit the public reading of the Hagiographa on Sabbath afternoon.[38] Accordingly these sources assume that but for this ordinance the reading of the Hagiographa—i. e. public study—would have been quite the thing to be expected. The interpretation of the statement of R. Akiba as given in Yerushalmi is therefore not only from the philological point of view, but also from the historical one by far preferable to that of Babli. The identification of חיצונים with מינים is, as we have seen, hardly possible and an interdict against the private reading of heretical books by R. Akiba is not very likely. Of his colleague Elisha ben Abbuyah[39] it is told that he was a passionate reader of heretical books. Later when he became an apostate his unwholesome reading was made responsible for his apostasy, but there is not the slightest indication that he was censured for his reading. The Palestinian Midrashim, even those of comparatively late

[36] On ברייתא see my article in the Jewish Encyclopedia, *s. v.* where the origin of this term is explained differently from the traditional one. The Hebrew משנה חיצונה occurs only in late writings.

[37] Comp. also the passage quoted above, page 118, from Mishnah Megillah, end; the reading of the story of Amnon undoubtedly refers not to liturgical use of this section of the Bible but to its public study.

[38] Comp. Shabbat, 116b, where the view of Rab is given that the Mishnah refers exclusively to public reading.

[39] Hagigah; Elisha ben Abbuyah was a younger contemporary of R. Akibah.

origin, like the Tanhumas have still the old Palestinian tradition that the interdict against the ס' החיצונים is directed against the Apocrypha and not against "heretical books", comp. Tanhuma Buber IV, 59, Tanhuma Behaaloteka 15, Bamidbar R. XIV, 4 and Kohelet[40] R. XII, 12. The last Midrash influenced by Babli warns against taking into the house any other book than the Bible. Pesikta Rabba III, 9a is likewise partly dependent upon the Babli and hence distinguishes between the non-canonical and the ספרים החיצונים. One of the outstanding features of the later Midrashim is the harmonizing of the Palestinian with the Babylonian traditions.

By an *argumentum ex silentio* one might prove too much. We have seen that in the entire Rabbinic literature of the first six centuries of the Common Era there is not one quotation from the now extant apocalyptic literature, and an easy explanation is at hand. The Jewish schools at Jabneh and Tiberias whose literary activities resulted in the production of Talmud and Midrash deliberately ignored the writings of their opponents, the so-called apocalyptic Pharisees. But how about the many other apocryphal writings, not of an apocalyptic nature of which not the slightest trace is to be found in the Rabbinical literature? Did the Rabbis at Jabneh detect the hidden Sadduceeism of the First Book of the Maccabees and withdraw it from circulation? They were certainly not Sadducees who, two centuries later,

[40] The present text of the Midrash is corrupt as it contains a self contradictory statement. If the "taking into the house" of any other book than the Bible "brings confusion", it is absurd to say that non-Biblical books were given for "reading and not for serious study"; books that one is not to take into the house were certainly not given for reading. In Yerushalmi Sanhedrin, the source of Kohelet Rabba, the translation of להגיון by "for reading" would give a satisfactory sense, as nothing is said there about not taking into the house any non-canonical books. I have elsewhere conclusively shown (comp. *Eine unbekannte Jüdische Sekte*, 70, 71; see also above note 28) that הגה is always "intensive study" or "meditation". The manuscript of the Yerushalmi in my "Yerushalmi Fragments", 262, has the correct reading להגיון נתנו ליגיעת ונו'. The Haggadic interpretation of Eccles. 12 12 takes this verse to refer to Scripture which alone is said to have been given for meditation and serious study—with the exclusion of all other writings which are not a subject for study. Targum paraphrases this verse in a very similar manner—on להג comp. Erubin, 21 b.

showed the Hebrew text of this apocryphal book to Origen and Jerome. It may be profitable to remember that in the entire Tannaitic literature only two non-Biblical books are mentioned by name: Megillat Taanit (Mishna Taanit II, 8) and Megillat Hassidim or Harissim (Sifre, Deut. 48 and Midrash Tannaim 42); the former thanks to its Halakhic contents is still extant, and the latter no longer so. The disappearance of the apocalyptic literature from among the Jews shows as little opposition on the part of the Rabbis to it as the disappearance of the Book of Judith shows any opposition of the Rabbis against this genuinely Pharisaic writing. The Synagogue at the time of the Tannaim did not use any book younger than Daniel and there is not one apocalyptic writing that antedates this Biblical book. One might add that, disregarding Ben Sira, which really enjoyed, at least for a time a semi-canonical character, it would be as difficult to prove the existence of a pre-Maccabean Apocryphon as that of a post-Maccabean Biblical book. There is therefore very little probability in the assumption that the Jewish schools that survived the destruction of Jerusalem rejected writings "which played an important part in the older religious life of Jerusalem and the dominions of Herod Antipas in the days when the Temple was yet standing and the Jewish state was still a reality".[41] The Rabbis of Jabneh would never have hit upon the time of the Maccabean revolution as the end of the period of inspiration. This distinction must have been conferred upon the time of the Maccabees at a very early date. It is perhaps not superfluous to call attention to the fact that the discussion at the school of Jabneh concerning the Canon points in the direction of a rather liberal attitude towards it, by far more so, than that taken by the schools of Shammai and Hillel at the time of the Jewish state. Ecclesiastes, Esther and Song of Songs were denied admission into the Canon by these schools, while the scholars at Jabneh declared them canonical. But there is no book mentioned that was excluded at Jabneh from the Canon and there is not the least likelihood that there ever existed such a one.[42]

[41] Prof. Burkitt, "*Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*", 10.

[42] That Ben Sira was a very popular book, no one would deny, but where are the proofs that it was considered canonical by Palestinian Jewry?

Professor Burkitt in his highly instructive lectures on "*Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*" quotes a saying by Rabban Johanan ben Zakkai which, he believes, really implies the renunciation of the apocalyptic idea, the notion that the Kingdom of God was an external state of things, which was just upon the point of being manifested and (as a corollary) that the person of insight could know something about it beforehand. This saying of Rabban Johanan reads: God revealed to Abram this world, but the world to come he did not reveal to him. In a note Professor Burkitt remarks that according to Rabbi Akiba, on the contrary, God revealed to Abram both this world and that which is to come. But, adds Professor Burkitt, Akiba unlike Johanan ben Zakkai believed that the Kingdom of God was at hand.[43]

If this however be so, one might as well quote R. Akiba's view to prove the predilection of the Rabbis for the apocalyptic idea as that of Rabbi Johanan in proof of their opposition to it. We know for certain that at the final delineation of the Canon Rabban Johanan was no longer living, while Rabbi Akiba took a very important part in the deliberations leading to it. Accordingly we certainly would expect a much more favorable attitude towards the apocalyptic writings from the school of Jabneh than from the schools of Shammai and Hillel in the year 66. That Rabbi Akiba did not stand isolated in his expectation of the imminent manifestation of the Kingdom of God is clearly shown by the "small apocalypse" found in the Mishna Sota, end, the only one of its kind in the entire Tannaitic literature. The author or transmitter of this apocalypse was no other than "Rabbi

[43] Genesis R. XLIV, 22, states only that R. Johanan and R. Akiba differ as to the nature of the revelation, at the "covenant between the pieces", but there is no way of telling who holds the one view and who the other, and one may doubt whether the saying attributed to R. Johanan by Prof. Burkitt does not really belong to R. Akiba. By the way, the difference of opinion between these Tannaim is of a purely exegetical nature, based upon the different interpretation of the ב in Genesis 15 18. II Baruch 4 4, and IV Ezra 3 13, 14 agree with the view that the time to come was shown to Abram, while among the Amoraim both views are represented; comp. Genesis R. l. c.

Eleazar the Great",[44] the favorite disciple of Rabban Johanan ben Zakkai. But even the master himself counted upon the speedy appearance of the Messiah with such certainty that one of his ordinances regulating a certain religious ceremony had its reason in this expectation.[45]

It would therefore not be true to the ascertainable facts to maintain that for the leading Rabbis in the first and the second generations after the destruction of the Temple the Messianic hopes were not as actual and real as they were for the generation living at the time of the great catastrophe or shortly before it.

A saying by Rabban Johanan ben Zakkai truly characteristic of the attitude of the Rabbis towards the apocalyptic idea is the following one; he said: "If thou hast a sapling in thy hands and thou art told: Behold, the Messiah has come, plant thy sapling and then go to meet him".[46] The Apocalyptics cut loose from life, the Rabbis were the guardians and leaders of a nation and they did not fail to see in the wild and vague visions of those dreamers a true menace to the physical and spiritual welfare of Israel.[47] Ethics is, if not entirely, at all events preeminently social ethics and the apocalyptic movement that flung itself with unrestrained imagination upon the future caring nothing for the present concerns and perils of the individual and the community was not only anti-social but also anti-ethical. If the Prophets had any successors they were not the Apocalyptics who forgot this world and with it men, but the Rabbis for whom the center of gravity of religion was not in a world beyond—important as that thought was—but in the actual life of man on earth. It is true, the ethical element was not ignored by the apocalyptic writers; with some of them it even played an important part.

[44] The reading: R. Joshua ben Hananaiah—another favored pupil of R. Johanan—is not based on good authority.

[45] Comp. Rosh Hashanah, 30 a, "speedily the temple will be erected". By "speedily" is meant there, as the content shows, the very next year. Comp. also Taanit 17 a: אסור.

[46] II Abot. R. Nathan, XXX, 67. Read מָלַךְ instead of לך.

[47] It would be very difficult to prove the contention that the attitude of the apocalyptic authors toward the Torah was different from that taken by the Rabbis.

This, however, must not deceive us, any more than it did the great Rabbis, who clearly perceived that the apocalyptic view, which lacked touch with the vital problems of man, really endangered the moral element in the Jewish religion.

The "end" is the outstanding feature of the apocalyptic writings and one is apt to forget of what great importance the "beginning" was to these authors. Yet very likely the vagaries and fantasmagoria of the apocalypses about creation or, to use the term of the Rabbis, "the works at the beginning", were primarily responsible for the disappearance of this kind of literature from among the Jews. As early as the time of Rabban Johanan ben Zakkai we meet with the prohibition against discussing the "beginning" with more than one person and this prohibition was the death knell for a goodly number of the apocalypses. A matter not to be discussed becomes quickly a matter not to be read.[48]

The demonology and angelology of the apocalypses not rarely discussed by them in connection with the story of creation were again of a nature that could not but repulse those who were not blind to the danger lurking in the attempt to turn popular fancy into a system of theology. The Rabbis and, of course, still more so the people undoubtedly believed in the existence of angels and demons. But like many other popular beliefs, they meant very little in the religious life of the people and still less in that of the Rabbis. The apocalyptic writings began to make wide use of these popular beliefs, first for purely literary reasons. In describing, for instance, an ascension to Heaven one could not well dispose of the angels or the description would have fallen flat; when God commands man can only obey, with an angel one can argue and dispute. Nor are the demons to be neglected, if one strives to achieve dramatic effects, as, for instance, the author of the book of Enoch in describing the depravity of mankind at the time of the deluge. What at the beginning was merely literary form gradually became theology, angels and demons began to be considered from a speculative point of view.

[48] Comp. Mishnah Hagigah II, 1, and Tosefta, II, 1. It is worth while noticing that Daniel is one of the very few apocalypses that does not contain cosmological speculations, and this apocalypse is the only one admitted into the canon.

The true leaders of Judaism saw the danger and therefore avoided as far as possible in their sayings and writings even the mentioning of angels and demons. It is certainly not an accident that the Mishna never speaks of angels or demons and that in the other Tannaitic sources they are very rarely referred to.

Of course, it would be an error to infer from it any disregard for angels and demons on the part of the Rabbis. But it is a far more grievous error to see in the widely developed demonology and angelology of the apocalypses the religious conceptions and sentiments of the people (Volksfrömmigkeit), in opposition to the teachings of the scribes (Schriftgelehrtentum) as found in the Tannaitic literature. Whatever the Rabbis might have been, we must not think of them as a class by themselves separated from the people; they were neither monks nor professors. They were of the people, lived with the people and worked for the people. Accordingly the most pronounced feature of the Haggadah of the Tannaim is its popular character, a great part thereof being the spoken word addressed by the Rabbis to the people. The apocalyptic writings by their fixed literary forms and their obscurities were not meant for the people, but for the initiated ones. The true mirror of the religious life of the Jews we find therefore in the homely and simple sayings and the teachings of the Rabbis and not in the literary productions of the Apocalyptic writers who wrote primarily for a "class" of men like themselves and not for the people.

THE PLACE OF APOCALYPTICAL CONCEPTIONS IN THE MIND OF JESUS

E. F. SCOTT
UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ABOUT twenty years have now passed since the apocalyptic theory of the Gospels came to the fore-front, and controversy has had time in the interval to follow the usual course. Extreme positions were at first adopted on either side. There were many scholars, liberal as well as conservative, who fought against the new interpretation, while others espoused it with a juvenile ardour, and insisted, like Schweitzer, that the teaching of Jesus must all be resolved into a "consistent eschatology". Since then the opinions on both sides have grown more moderate. It cannot be said that any full agreement is yet in sight, but at any rate we have learned to approach the question dispassionately. Those who were frightened by the new hypothesis have now got accustomed to it, and are willing to acknowledge that at some points it answers to the facts. Those who were dazzled by its novelty are coming to see it in due perspective, and to do justice to other aspects of the thought of Jesus which they formerly left out of account.

That Jesus was in sympathy with the apocalyptic hopes of his time and that he understood them in no merely metaphorical sense, can now be regarded as certain. He took up the message of John the Baptist, who undoubtedly announced a Kingdom of God such as the people were looking for. He proclaimed his gospel in terms which bore a definite apocalyptic meaning, and we cannot believe that he perplexed his hearers by employing them in some new esoteric sense of his own. His sayings about

the nature of the Kingdom and the manner of its coming can be parallelled again and again from the surviving apocalyptic literature. Add to all this that the primitive church admittedly looked for his return in Messianic glory to inaugurate a visible Kingdom of God. There is indeed every ground for believing that the church accentuated the apocalyptic note in his message. Not only were the disciples very ordinary men, who would interpret in a crude and literal sense much that he may have spoken figuratively, but they were overpowered by the tremendous events which had closed his career. They were in a mood to expect miracles, and to read back a marvellous significance into all that he had done and said. The promises recorded in the Gospels may in large measure be the outcome of those extravagant hopes which prevailed in the early church. Yet there must have been something in the teaching itself that warranted the interpretation now placed on it.

Admitting, however, that he worked with apocalyptic ideas it by no means follows that everything in his message must be fitted into a "consistent eschatology". This phrase, indeed, is meaningless, for the one thing certain about Jewish apocalyptic thinking is that it had no consistency. In their forecasts of the final events no two of the extant writings are consistent with each other, and no one writing, for that part, is consistent with itself. There are certain broad ideas which pervade apocalyptic as a whole, but the different writers all feel themselves at liberty to modify and adapt them, and to express their own beliefs in terms of the traditional imagery. Are we to demand from Jesus alone that every detail in his forecast must bear a fixed meaning, and fit in exactly with a rigid scheme? We recognise that the authors of Enoch and 4 Esdras had a practical purpose in view, and that it modified and controlled their apocalyptic thinking. Are we to assume that Jesus sacrificed everything to apocalyptic consistency? He may surely be credited also with some practical religious purpose, which meant more to him than the forms in which he expressed it.

So the apocalyptic of Jesus is not consistent, even if it be granted that his teaching is mainly apocalyptic. But this cannot be granted. The apocalyptic element does not bulk largely in

the record, even as we have it, and when due allowance is made for all that has been read in by the evangelists it shrinks to a far smaller proportion. The affinities of Jesus when we judge him by his teaching as a whole were much more with the prophets than with the apocalyptists. That the apocalyptic strain is present, often where we might least suspect it, need not be denied. It runs through the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer, as well as through the sayings about the future. But its function almost everywhere is to enforce a message that is *not* apocalyptic. Even for John the Baptist the hope of the Kingdom had value, not for its own sake, but as the lever for a moral appeal. "The day is at hand,—you are to stand presently before the Judge: therefore repent." Much more the real message of Jesus is independent of the apocalyptic ideas and can easily be detached from them. His demand was for a new kind of life, a new relation to God, and while he looked for the Kingdom his interest was in those moral requirements which it involved.

Indeed it may fairly be argued that although Jesus fell in with the apocalyptic outlook his thought was in inward contradiction to it, and that not a few of the difficulties which have been brought to light by the modern enquiry are due to this cause. The two outstanding features of apocalyptic thought are that the Kingdom lies in the future, and that it will come suddenly by the immediate act of God. However much they differ in their conceptions the apocalyptists all share these two primary beliefs; and they could not do otherwise, in view of the very nature of apocalyptic. It was the outgrowth of a profound pessimism. For the time being God seemed to have withdrawn from the government of the world. Doubtless he was still King, but with the evil present He could do nothing, and His people must be content to wait patiently for the coming day when he would assert His sovereignty. It followed that when His Kingdom *did* come it would appear suddenly and miraculously. In the world now running to decay there were no regenerating forces which by their own action would gradually bring about the better time. God must Himself interpose, by an immediate act of power.

Now these fundamental beliefs of apocalyptic were both foreign to the mind of Jesus. Not only so, but they were directly opposed

to the convictions he lived by, and which underlie all his teaching. He believed that God rules the world and that everything is ordered by Him, so that not a sparrow falls to the ground without His knowledge. In this absolute trust that God is sovereign he submitted himself unreservedly to the will of God, and called on his followers to do likewise. To be sure he says much about the coming Kingdom, yet what he demands is not the apocalyptic faith that in some future time all wrongs will be righted, but the faith that God is reigning now, in spite of all the mystery in which His ways are enshrouded. This is the very heart of the religion of Jesus. If we conceive of him as merely the herald of a future Kingdom we take the key-stone out of his teaching and out of the whole story of his life. In like manner, he is in conflict with the apocalyptic view that no forces for good are working in the present, and that if the Kingdom comes it must break in by a miraculous act. He sees the goodness of God in the rain and the sunshine, in the natural kindness of men to one another, in the impulses that are continually leading them to better things. He makes his appeal, ever and again, to the goodness that is present in men, and tries to foster and direct it, so that it may help on the divine purposes. Not only does he recognise that forces for good are operative, but he believes that in the last resort there are no other forces. Evil by its nature is unreal and self-destructive. Only the good has power, and those who follow it may be confident that sooner or later it will overcome, and fulfil itself. With such a belief as this he did not need to expect the apocalyptic miracle. To stake everything upon it would indeed have been little short of treason to his own deepest convictions. Men had come to look for it because their faith had failed, because they had ceased to discern the moral forces or had despaired of their effecting anything. The whole aim of Jesus was to restore that faith which apocalyptic, with its doctrine of a Kingdom which could only come by miracle, had implicitly denied.

There has been much discussion of those isolated sayings in which Jesus appears to speak of the Kingdom as in some sense present. Most of them can be explained away, and it has often been assumed that when we have got rid of them his thought

falls perfectly into line with that of the apocalyptists. To some writers this has appeared so certain that they construe the ethical teaching as nothing more than an "interim ethic", valid only for the short interval before the Kingdom will set in. Others, like Professor Lake in the "Beginnings of Christianity", have more justly inferred that Jesus did not bind himself to apocalyptic theory, but was influenced also by Rabbinical conceptions of the Kingdom as already in being. A new and hopeful field of enquiry is opened by this suggestion. But the problem after all is not one of balancing a few disputed sayings against a number of others, of apparently different tenor. We have rather to deal with a contradiction between the forms employed by Jesus and the inner drift and purport of his message. He declared that the Kingdom was future and must come suddenly and miraculously, as the apocalyptists had taught; and yet he never wavers in his belief that God is reigning, God is silently working *now*. Was he himself aware of the contradiction? Probably not. He took over the apocalyptic ideas as they were current in his time, without reflecting on their origin or on the philosophy that lay behind them. While accepting them with full sincerity he took from them what he needed, allowing all the rest to fall out of sight. They served to make real to him his vision of a better world, in which the will of God should absolutely prevail. They offered him a definite goal towards which he could work and to which he could point his followers. But all the time they were borrowed from a type of thought which was alien to him, and we are not justified in so emphasizing them as to hide his distinctive message. Jewish apocalyptic, when all is said, has not provided us with the key to the teaching of Jesus. At the most it has given us the key to his mode of expressing himself, to the forms under which he thought and by which he was restricted. The real task still remains of exploring the message itself.

The recent attempts to construe the gospel as an apocalyptic must therefore be regarded as mistaken, or at any rate as one-sided. It would be truer to maintain that Jesus destroyed the apocalyptic view of the world, just as he destroyed the Law, although in both cases he claimed to be fulfilling. While he speaks in apocalyptic language and declares that the expected

Kingdom is just at hand, he throws all the weight on ideas of a moral and spiritual nature. He makes the apocalyptic hope subserve these ideas, which were bound in process of time to burst the apocalyptic sheath. This, as a matter of history, is what happened before the first century was over. The message of Jesus as its true implications came to light was found to have shattered the apocalyptic scheme which at first seemed vital to it. Jesus himself, like other great teachers, was unable to foresee the consequences of his own thought. He held to the apocalyptic beliefs and so expressed his message that it might seem to be wholly determined by them. Millennarians can appeal confidently to his actual words. A writer like Tyrrell can plausibly argue that the concern of Jesus was wholly with the coming supernatural order, and that his gospel is best presented in the symbols and sacraments by which the Catholic church attaches itself to that order. But a deeper criticism will only strengthen the conviction which has always forced itself on the plain sense of Christian men. For the mind of Jesus the apocalyptic ideas were not primary. He believed in the new will, in the wisdom and goodness of the Father who ordains all things, in the moral forces which in the end will overcome all evil. By means of apocalyptic, and when necessary in spite of it, He sought to proclaim this faith.

THE 'SON OF MAN' IN THE USAGE OF JESUS

B. W. BACON
YALE UNIVERSITY

TO students accustomed to think of "meekness and lowliness" as typical traits in the personal character of Jesus there was distinct relief in the authoritative declaration of eminent philologians some twenty years ago, that the self-designation 'the Son of Man' would be unintelligible in the Palestinian Aramaic of Jesus' time, so that the title with all its connotations of superhuman authority and dignity must be ascribed to the period after the development of the resurrection faith, and could not be an embodiment of Jesus' thought concerning himself.

The relief was all the greater to students who deplored the exaggeration, on the part of the so-called Eschatological school, of the extent to which Jesus' admitted acceptance of current apocalyptic beliefs affected his primary message. Some of us still feel that his primary message was of a different, almost an opposite type; a message of faith and hope, not of despair; glad tidings of a Power for good already at work in the world, and manifesting itself in human hearts, a Power like the subtle working of leaven, or the vitality of seeds, to whose quiet, inconspicuous working would be due the real accomplishment whereof the dramatic Day of Jehovah would be little more than the "manifestation".

Then came Dalman's *Worte Jesu* which seemed to prove, against those of the school of Schmidt and Wellhausen, that Jesus could quite well have employed the term *Bar nasha* in the sense required by the Gospel contexts, if he had so chosen,

without becoming unintelligible to his auditors. He would have been understood to mean by it "that 'mortal' (Menschenkind) referred to in Dan. 7 13 as 'brought with clouds to the Ancient of Days', to receive on Israel's behalf the everlasting kingdom". None of these expressions, 'the kingdom', 'the Ancient of Days', 'the Son of Man' would be intelligible in Jesus' utterance without implied reference to former use in a special and technical sense. But we certainly know that such technical use had been made of the first of the three, and there seems to be no small amount of evidence that such was the case also with the last. To what extent the expression *Bar nasha* was actually current in this sense is not the primary question, nor is it the extent to which it may have acquired, through the usage of *Enoch* and similar apocalypses, new connotations not intended in Daniel. The primary question is simply: Could Jesus have used the term as the Gospels represent, though not necessarily on the particular occasions, nor with the particular intention and connotation which they assume? This question, it would appear, can only be answered in the affirmative. One cannot object the non-appearance of the term in Paul, because Paul has other means of presenting the same doctrine, and unlike the evangelists was not translating from the Aramaic.

Those who were reluctant to accept Dalman's proofs that Jesus might have used the apocalyptic term might be expected on the other hand to welcome his suggestion that Jesus used it in a sense nearer to the original, Danielic sense than to that placed upon it by the apocalyptists who took it over. According to Dalman Jesus used the title Son of Man only to mean what I may call the Suppliant on Israel's behalf at the judgment-seat of the King of kings. In his own words (*op. cit.* p. 217):

> If Jesus attached to Peter's confession of his Messiahship the first announcement of his violent death, this was in order to make it clear that accession to his dominion was still far off, and that Christhood did not imply, but on the contrary excluded, his intervening on his own behalf. Now the "one like unto a son of man" of Dan. 7 13 is one who has yet to receive his dominion. He *might* be one who should have

passed through suffering and death. In any case he is by his very nature no mighty one, no conqueror, no destroyer, but merely a 'mortal' (Menschenkind), whom God has taken under his protection, and for whom he destines great things.

Unfortunately this distinction of Dalman's between the ordinary, apocalyptic sense in which the title was commonly understood in Jesus' time, and the purely Danielic original sense of a suppliant Son of Man, is not borne out by the Gospel records. Jesus has indeed but slight sympathy with the apocalyptists; but we have no ground in this case as in his employment of the title "Messiah" (χριστός), for maintaining that he undertook to raise the ordinary term to a new level of meaning "according to the things of God". The Gospels offer no indication as regards this title that he used it in any other than the commonly accepted sense. For if he had made the distinction there was the greatest occasion for the evangelists noting the fact.

Two points, however, do seem to have been established by Dalman and later writers in the course of this long controversy. (1) Jesus did make frequent use, even in his earlier ministry, of this peculiar expression "the Son of Man", using it as a designation for the agent of divine justice in Jehovah's 'Day'.[1] (2) In the latter part of his ministry Jesus so far departed from his usual objective, non-committal references to 'the Son of Man', his 'Day', or his 'Coming', and the like, as to suggest to his disciples a connection between this event and his own fate; though the suggestion may not have been brought home to them until the tragedy of Calvary recalled it in a lurid light.

If I may be permitted to anticipate the results of the study which I must presently describe in detail I would suggest the following as the historical facts which best account for all the phenomena.

(1) From the outset Jesus had a Son of Man doctrine. In taking up the Baptist's warning to repentance Jesus could

[1] On this point see the definite pronouncement of the editors of *Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. I, p. 374: "Few things are so probable as the use of Son of Man by Jesus".

not but refer to the Being of whom John had spoken as coming after him to winnow Jehovah's threshing-floor, gathering the wheat into his garner, and burning up the chaff with unquenchable fire, John is not speaking of Jehovah, to whom the saying "I am not worthy to loose his shoe's latchet" would not be applicable. Neither does he mean the Angel of the Covenant, of whom the phraseology derived from Malachi might incline us to think. The personality in mind is human, though endowed with miraculous powers, for it is when he hears of "the mighty works" done by Jesus that John sends to enquire: "Art thou the Coming One (ὁ ἐρχόμενος)?" The personality is the same, though John does not use (perhaps we may say, avoids using) the distinctive title.

(2) Jesus uses the distinctive title, but from the very nature of the case cannot have used it in application to himself during that period of his ministry wherein his messiahship was still a 'secret'. In all his utterances down to the revelation of this secret to the Twelve at Caesarea Philippi, and in all his *public* utterances down to the last, Jesus' use of the title must have been impersonal and objective, as who should say: "He whom Jehovah will send to execute His judgment". This necessary reserve is vividly illustrated in the incident of the Baptist's Enquiry; for the reply is purposely ambiguous. Its substance is: "Tell John of the work of saving grace which you see God accomplishing through me, and not to let the question of my personality stand in the way of the hope and cheer it should bring him". The refusal of a categorical reply on the question put stands at swords' points with the representation of the evangelist that in the very next breath Jesus openly spoke of himself to the surrounding multitude as "the Son of Man". The evangelist's idea is not that of his source.

(3) After the close of the Galilean ministry, confronted with the alternative of abandoning his mission to Israel or carrying his message to the national centre, Jesus reveals the fact that he has also a Son of David doctrine. In spite of recent very high authority in denial of this, no other explanation of the course of events from this time on until the rallying of the scattered flock under leadership of Peter to the watchword

"God hath made him both Lord and Christ" seems to me historically credible. From Caesarea Philippi on the movement of Jesus took on a nationalistic character. The religious ideal was to be attained through Israel's acceptance of his leadership in place of the husbandmen who refused to Jehovah the fruits of His vineyard. It is impossible to imagine belief in his messiahship growing up *after* the crucifixion. It is almost equally impossible to account for the conduct of friends or enemies before the great catastrophe without this claim on Jesus' part to *messianic* leadership.

(4) The problem grows out of the relation of these two beliefs, in this chronological relation. Not, first the doctrine of personal adherence to Jesus as Son of David, to which certain more or less incongruous attributes of the Son of Man become attached; but, first a doctrine of the Coming One, the Son of Man, quite without reference to the person of Jesus, followed through pressure of harsh necessity by the appeal to a personal loyalty centering in Jesus as anointed Leader of Israel toward a kingdom "according to the things of God". For

(5) At Caesarea Philippi the alternative had also to be faced of rejection and death. This was indeed the more probable of the two. Would this mean the failure of the divine ideal? Certainly not. But if not, the victory would have to come "on the clouds of heaven". The kingdom must be given not to a Son of David here on earth, but to a Son of Man (who may of course be no other than this same Son of David) at the judgment seat of the Highest. Until Calvary no follower of Jesus could have said by which road the deliverance must come. After it, rallying faith could not fail to lay hold of the Danielic prophecy to which the Gospels with one consent bear witness Jesus had himself appealed in presenting the alternative; and the bridge was the Isaian doctrine of the sacrificed Servant. Over this the broken following of Jesus, dismayed at the tragedy because unwilling with him to confront the darker as well as the more hopeful alternative, returned to its allegiance and an ultimate triumph.

On the whole it seems improbable that Jesus himself made

any appeal to the Isaian prophecy. But Paul is explicit in teaching that this was a foundation stone of the primitive faith. All sources unite in attributing to Peter and his associates in the first days after the great tragedy, the discovery, as by revelation of God, that "thus it behooved the Christ to suffer and to enter into his glory". First the doctrine of the Coming One, the Son of Man; second the doctrine of the Son of David, to whom it is the Father's good pleasure to give the kingdom; third the discovery that "according to the Scriptures" the Servant humbled and obedient unto a sacrificial death, is also he who is "exalted and made very high". Such is the progress of doctrine according to the testimony of New Testament Christology. Whether the phenomena of the documents in their use of the title Son of Man bear out this provisional understanding is the problem with which we have now to concern ourselves.

The most recent, and certainly one of the most scholarly discussions of this subject appears in Chapter IV of the well known work *Beginnings of Christianity* (1920) under the caption "Christology". The authors agree that analysis of Mark, our oldest Gospel, reveals the fact that to this evangelist Jesus was preeminently "the Christ", but (as these authors hold) not because he was "the Son of David"; rather because he was the Son of Man. The efforts of the later Synoptists to overcome the adverse implications of Mk. 12 35–37 by prefixing the genealogies and stories of the infancy they regard as a leading proof "that Jesus did not claim to be or consider himself to be the 'Davidic Messiah'" (p. 366). This was a subsequent development possibly "hastened by the conversion to Christianity of Jews who had maintained the claims of the Davidic dynasty against the Hasmonaeans or the Herods". By the time of the later strata of Synoptic tradition and the earlier chapters of Acts:

> the identification of Jesus with the Scion of David had become a prominent part of Christian belief; to prove the Davidic claim of Jesus is one of the chief objects of the genealogies in Matthew and Luke. But the figure of the Scion of David had coalesced with that of the Son of Man rather than taken its place, and the term 'Christ' covered

both. Moreover, this merging of the two figures with each other was the result of their identification with Jesus, not the cause of it. The Anointed Son of Man is the anointed son of David not because the two figures were originally identical, or because 'anointed' was a Jewish title which could only belong to one person, but because Christians found both the Son of Man and the Son of David in Jesus, and therefore were forced to say that the Son of Man is the Son of David, and to attribute to either figure everything believed or prophesied of the other.

We can agree to the conclusion drawn by the editors that "the idea of the Son of David was added to that of the Son of Man, rather than the Son of Man to that of the Son of David" if it be recognized that the "merging of the two figures" is not a mere literary phenomenon in the early history of Gospel tradition, but something for which Jesus is himself responsible, whether in explicit words, or by implication, when he compelled his disciples to face the unwelcome possibility of martyrdom. Mark is indeed careful to show that in identifying himself with "the Christ" Jesus expressly disclaimed "Davidic" messiahship. That is called a conception "after the things of men", Satanic, part of the blindness which even Peter still shares with his people. According to Mark Jesus claims to be "the Christ" only in so far as this title has the apocalyptic sense of Son of Man. For this reason he attaches after his account of Peter's Confession a story of vision and Voice from heaven manifesting to Peter and his companions the true nature of the Christ and his redemptive work. It is to be "not according to the things of men, but of God". What seems to be overlooked in this able discussion of Markan Christology is the fact that this Gospel evinces not a primitive so much as an advanced stage in Christian belief. The Christ ἀγενεαλόγητος of Ps. 110 belongs to the typical Christology of the writer of Hebrews. Paul not only places this Christology in the very forefront of his systematic presentation of his gospel (Rom. 1 4), but forestalls Mark's antithesis between it and the mundane Christhood both here (Rom. 1 3) and elsewhere (II Cor. 5 16).

In this opposition to the Son of David Christology Mark

is not so much primitive as Pauline, and in opposing he presupposes. For the disproof of the expectation of "the scribes" in Mk. 12 35-37 is as much an answer to the cry "Thou son of David" of Bartimaeus and the multitude (10 47f; 11 10) as the Transfiguration vision to the Confession of Peter. Mk. 12 35-37 is an editorial supplement to the debate with Pharisee, Sadducee, and Scribe (12 13-34), not an original feature of the source. The Roman evangelist is anti-Jewish Christian.

Nor is Mark primitive in his use of the title Son of Man. He borrows it unexplained from earlier sources, assuming that his readers will know that it was (to use the modern phrase) "a favorite self-designation of Jesus". His prologue (Mk. 1 1-13), in which Jesus is simply "the Christ", "the Son of God" in the sense of I Pt. 1 20f. (not to say of Col. 1 15-17), defines his Christology once for all. He uses the title Son of Man as the appropriate one for certain connections (whose significance we have to search into), but his readers are supposed to know that this is a title which should have reminded the Jews of a Christhood according to the things of God, which they in their πώρωσις were blind to.

We cannot, therefore, accept the conclusion of our Cambridge scholars that:

> The Christians who first of all regarded Jesus as the anointed Son of Man, the judge of the world, came soon to accept the popular expectation and to regard Jesus as the anointed Scion of David as well as the Son of Man.

Previous to his death Jesus' followers did not regard him as the Son of Man. The turning point of their faith was when, after the catastrophe, they began to do so. But they might never have come to the point of making this identification, near as it lay in view of Jesus' words of assurance as he neared the cross, had not the coincidence of his work and fate with that predicted for the Isaian Servant come first to their mind. We do agree, however, with these eminent scholars that the solution of the question must come through tracing

> the meaning and connotation of these other titles (besides Χριστός)—Son of Man and Servant—in order to see how much

they represent in the earliest thought of the disciples, and how they were treated by Gentiles who had no previous knowledge of their meaning.

For this purpose our authors subjoin a table of occurrences of the title Son of Man in I. Marcan Passages; II. Passages in Q; III. Passages peculiar to Matthew; IV. Passages peculiar to Luke (p. 375f.). By comparison of these statistics two main inferences are drawn. (1) Mark and Q agree in the mass of passages "in which 'Son of Man' is used in connection with the Parousia. He is to come unexpectedly on the clouds of heaven, seated at the right hand of power". (2) "In Mark, but not in Q, there are equally noticeable passages in which the name of Son of Man is connected not with the Parousia, but with the Passion". These outstanding facts can only be accepted. It is doubtless also the fact that the Gospel writers have in a number of instances substituted the title for a simple "I" of the original, and probable that in one case (Mt. 8 20 = Lk. 9 58)—a case not so reckoned by the authors—'Son of Man' is due to literal translation of an Aramaic proverbial saying.[2] The three passages which the Cambridge authors adduce as instances of this we cannot accept. We reject the first (Mk. 2 28) because verse 27, on which their argument is based, is a typical instance of 'Western non-interpolation' and so forms no part of the authentic text. We reject the other two because of difference of interpretation.[3] Finally we must demur to the statement (p. 386) that "In Mark and Q there are no signs of any identification of Jesus with the sufferer of Isaiah 53". The references to Isaiah in Mark are rare, and even of these Mk. 9 12 has all the appearance of a gloss (though a gloss already known to Matthew; cf. Mt. 17 12). But "the Son of Man goeth, even as it is written of him" (Mk. 14 21) is surely a "clear reference to Is. 53", and confirms the indications that "the use of the word παραδίδωμι in Mark 14 18, 21, etc., is connected with the constant use of the same word in Isaiah 53". True, Mark is no more primary in his use of the Servant theme

[2] See below, p. 159.
[3] See below, p. 163.

than in his use of Son of David, or Son of Man. His references (including the reference to Ps. 22 1 in the duplicate to Mk. 15 37 prefixed in verses 34–36) are borrowed and unexplained. But in addition to his confirmation of the witness of Q that Jesus habitually spoke of the Coming one of John the Baptist as "the Son of Man" Mark certainly warrants our laying down the following as historic facts.

(1) From the time when Jesus set his face to go up to Jerusalem, but not before, Jesus turned his disciples' attention to his own personality, placing loyalty to himself in the foreground as essential to the cause.

(2) Without this change from an impersonal preaching of repentance in view of impending judgment to a direct effort to inaugurate a national movement under his personal leadership neither the popular support accorded to Jesus in his defiance of the hierocracy at Jerusalem, nor his execution by Pilate, nor the subsequent rallying to his banner of adherents who proclaimed him "the Christ", predicting his return as Son of Man, and explaining his sufferings as divinely appointed for the Servant, can be made historically intelligible.

(3) The self-devoting loyalty which animated Jesus' followers and explains this historical sequence was not obtained on the plea: "This is the Son of Man"; but "This is the Son of David". The more Mark is opposed to a Jewish-Christian type of Christology the more conclusive is his unwilling witness to this fact.

In order to show that the phenomena of the Gospels in their employment of the title Son of Man are in accordance with the growth of Christology as thus described we may now turn to a new survey of these employments, using a tabulation made independently of the present issues by Professor N. Schmidt, s. v. "Son of Man" in the Encyclopaedia Biblica (vol. iv., col. 4713).

A beginning has been made in the task of discriminating the usage of the various Gospel writers by Harnack in his attempted reconstruction of the "Second Source".[4] We may

[4] *Sprüche und Reden*, English: *The Sayings of Jesus, the Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke*, 1908.

properly speak of this "Second Source" as the oldest, for Wellhausen's attempt to explain the relation between it and Mark by dependence on the side of Mark has been reversed by almost unanimous consent. Harnack himself leaves open the question whether the relation in the case of Mark is that of direct literary dependence; but on the question of priority he feels no hesitation. After isolating by the usual processes the Q (or Second-Source) material, he undertakes the enquiry whether in it "the Son of Man" is already assumed to be "a favorite self-designation of Jesus". One who carefully follows his study of all the data will find it hard to escape the conclusion that in Q such is really the case. Harnack states his conclusion as follows (p. 239):

> We must acknowledge that in Q the phrase has become simply a term which our Lord ordinarily used when speaking of himself. Seeing that Q pays no regard to chronology, this source is not suitable as an authority upon which to base investigations as to the period at which our Lord began so to describe himself. Such investigations can only be based upon the Gospel of St. Mark. Q, however, gives some help in that we learn from this source how completely and quickly the consciousness, that there was once a time when our Lord did not so name himself, had vanished from tradition. There can scarcely be any doubt as to the sense of the expression in Q. If in Q the only historical passages—historical, that is, in the narrower sense of the word—are the narratives of the testimony of the Baptist to the coming Messiah, (of the Baptism), and of the Messianic temptation, and if then abruptly and repeatedly the expression "the Son of Man" crops up in the collection of sayings, it necessarily follows that in Q the term can mean nothing else than "the Messiah"

Harnack, accordingly, considers that the title "Son of Man" had already been introduced in this precanonical source in a systematic way, as equivalent to "the Messiah". In Q, as later, it occurs only in the mouth of Jesus. As reported by Matthew (not Luke) the Source itself refers to Jesus as ὁ Χριστός (Mt. 11 2?). But Harnack justly regards the representation as

unhistorical, at least as respects "the period at which our Lord began so to describe himself". In a footnote to the passage he is quite specific:

> Of course one cannot be sure that Jesus always called himself Son of Man in those passages where Q makes him thus speak of himself. It is, for example, more than doubtful that Jesus used the expression in section 15 (Mt. 11 19 = Lk. 7 34), when before, in the same discourse (section 14, Mt. 11 2ff. = Lk. 7 18ff.), he had plainly enough avoided any messianic self-designation.

In recognizing such systematic self-designation by Jesus to be inadmissible for the earlier period of the ministry Harnack is of course only confirming the admission of Dalman. Both yield to the common-sense consideration that such use would be incompatible with Jesus' admitted 'reserve' regarding his own person and destiny. But in referring us to Mark for more reliable testimony Harnack certainly does not promote the solution of the problem. For notoriously neither Mark nor any other extant Gospel gives any explanation of the term itself, nor of the use to which it is put by Jesus. If an explanation be sought we must seek it in the remoter period back of our extant Gospels.

For Mark is fully as unhistorical and anachronistic as Q in his representation of the usage of Jesus. At the very outset, in Mk. 2 10 and 28, this evangelist represents Jesus as meeting the objection of the scribes to his pronouncing forgiveness of sins, and of the Pharisees to his disregard of the Sabbath, by a defiant claim to have authority as "the Son of Man", even while still on earth, before ascending to his heavenly judgment seat, both to forgive sins and to set aside the institutions of Mosaism. In Jn. 5 1–47 this line of argument is carried to its logical issue. On occasion of a similar healing and disregard of the Sabbath Jesus is made to say (ver. 26f.):

> For as the Father hath life in himself, even so gave he to the Son also to have life in himself (cf. Mk. 3 4): and he gave him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of Man.

The dogmatic intention of the second evangelist to prove the claim of Jesus to superhuman authority (ἐξουσία) by appeal to his mighty works is unmistakable; but not more so than his indifference to historical consistency in making Jesus publicly defend this claim while at the same time keeping secret his Messianic calling and functions. But the inconsistency is much easier to explain if in this anachronistic use of the title 'Son of Man' Mark is not setting a precedent, but merely extending to wider use an unhistorical representation of the Second Source. Our first task, accordingly, must be to appraise at their true value the conclusions of Harnack regarding the use of this title in Q.

Great as are the exceptions which the present writer feels compelled to take to Harnack's views on other points, such as the nature of the Second Source, and its relation to Matthew and Luke respectively, it must be admitted that on the question here in debate his inferences represent not a maximum but a minimum. The Second Source is not Q. That is one of the misleading ambiguities of Harnack's treatment. Q is only the common material of Matthew and Luke which these two later Synoptists do not derive from Mark. It is (broadly speaking) what English critics used to call the 'double-tradition' material. The larger part of this is certainly taken from a written document which when employed by Matthew and Luke was already in the Greek language. We designate it the Second Source, because it stands next to Mark in the proportion of material it has furnished the two later Synoptists. How much of the single-tradition material of Matthew and Luke respectively has also been taken from this Source we can only judge by intrinsic affinities between it and Q material already accepted.

Then there is the 'triple-tradition' material, that is, material found in all three Synoptics. Usually it is in such form and context as to prove that Matthew and Luke have independently borrowed it from Mark. How much of this may have been taken by Mark himself from the Second Source, we have but the slenderest means of judging. Harnack goes to the extreme in excluding everything but Q material from his judgment of the nature of the Source. He admits nothing from single

tradition material, nothing from the triple tradition. He even excludes a portion of what other critics regard as genuine double-tradition material because it differs widely in form as between the two witnesses Matthew and Luke. This is done with small consideration for the fact that the differences can sometimes be explained as due to editorial changes characteristic of the evangelist in question. The basis of judgment for Harnack is therefore certainly a minimum.

This method is manifestly the safe one. It may do injustice to the constructive affirmations we might be able to make as to the nature of the Source. In point of fact it has led Harnack himself to certain unwarranted conclusions as to the fragmentary and incoherent character of the Source. Others, carried away by the illusion (unfortunately shared by Harnack) that Papias had something to say about this Source, something connecting it with the Apostle Matthew and describing its character, have pushed these unwarranted conclusions to still greater lengths. But these do not affect the question before us, save to reduce the material available for proof. Whatever else may have belonged to the Second Source we are sure of the main sections of Q material, and in these Harnack's conclusions are already justified. As our enquiries continue they will plainly appear as corroborated and reenforced by the data otherwise attainable.

The relatively small number of occurrences in the fourth Gospel may be omitted from present consideration. Interesting as is the usage which characterizes this Hellenistic Gospel, its comparatively late and dependent relation to the other three, and the theological rather than historical aim of the evangelist are so generally admitted, that we may reasonably confine our survey to the Synoptists and the Second Source. Here it may prove possible by comparison of each with the rest to determine with greater or less probability what principles have controlled the usage, both as respects occurrences merely transcribed from earlier sources and extensions undertaken by the evangelist on his own responsibility. Let us consider first the extensions.

We may probably assume a general assent to the conclusion of Harnack regarding the usage of Q in its broadest, most general form, that some of the occurrences in the Second

Source are due to the evangelist rather than to Jesus himself. The particular instance Harnack has in view is that of the saying contrasting the work of "the Son of Man" with that of the Baptist in the Q discourse on this subject (Mt. 11 19 = Lk. 7 34). But there may well be other cases also in which the pre-canonical evangelist has substituted the title for the personal pronoun according to his own idea of fitness. On the other hand only an extreme and unreasonably sceptical criticism would venture to assume that he had no historical foundation at all for his practice of limiting his use of the term to utterances of Jesus. We may therefore probably assume a general assent also to the converse proposition: Some of the occurrences in Q represent the actual usage of Jesus. A survey of the eight instances enumerated by Schmidt in the strictly Q material, that is, occurrences presented in common by Matthew and Luke in non-Markan material, ought to throw some light on the question what sort of usage, if any, came down to the pre-canonical evangelist by tradition or otherwise as representative of Jesus, and what sort of usage is typical of himself.

Of the eight occurrences in Q four, or precisely one-half, are of a single type and occur in a single connection. All four are found in the eschatological discourse of Mt. 24 27-44, paralleling Lk. 17 24-30 and 12 40. The section forms part of Matthew's parallel to the eschatological discourse of Mark (Mk. 13), combining with it that of the Second Source in Lk. 17 20-37, just as Luke himself has combined elements from both in his own parallel to Mark (Lk. 21). The general theme of the entire context is the 'Day of the Son of Man', a day of his sudden Coming, a Day of judgment unescapable, for which one must prepare by sincere repentance. For the evangelists the equivalence "The Son of Man = Jesus redivivus" is a matter of course. Their writings are certainly of later date than the utterances of Paul himself and of others referred to in 1 Thess. 1 10 and 4 15-17, wherein his converts are reminded how he had taught them to wait for God's Son from heaven, "even Jesus who delivereth us from the wrath to come". The doctrine is assured by "a word of the Lord", probably uttered by the Spirit through some Christian 'prophet', that

> The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God.

We also have a reminder in 2 Cor. 5 10, and (if the reading be correct) in Rom. 14 10 also, that we must all "stand before the judgment seat of Christ" to receive the due reward of our deeds. Paul eschews the term, but the belief is primitive and general. Why, then, should not the very earliest Gospel sources reflect it in the "favorite self-designation"?

But it is at least worthy of our notice that in the utterances themselves the assumed equivalence is conspicuously absent.[5] Jesus speaks objectively and in the third person of "the Son of Man" as the agent of the divine judgment. In all these warnings to Repent, because of the Coming, the Day, the Judgment, of the Son of Man, there is no suggestion that Jesus thinks of himself as the Coming One. Indeed in such utterances of similar warning as Mt. 5 25 f. = Lk. 12 58 f., where the title "Son of Man" does not appear, it is much more natural to think of God as Judge. This is apparently the case, so far as the saying itself is concerned, in Mt. 10 32 f. = Lk. 12 8 f. For here Jesus himself (Luke "the Son of Man") is present, not as Judge, but as Witness on behalf of those who have loyally confessed him on the earth. The inference would seem to be that while Jesus availed himself of expressions common to the current apocalyptic eschatology, such as "the Day", the "Coming", the "Sign" of the "Son of Man", he left the question of his own relation to this Coming One quite open, at least in his public exhortations to repentance.

Since there is no need to suppose that Jesus intended in these four utterances any such identification of his own personality with "the Son of Man" as the evangelists assume, and the linguistic objection appears not to be sustained, there can be no good reason for questioning their authenticity. The case is far otherwise with the other four occurrences of 'double tradition'. Apart from the fact that all four are conspicuously open to the objection that they violate the principle of "reserve", they are individually subject to other adverse considerations.

[5] Lk. 17 25 is not in the source.

(1) The logion "The Son of Man hath not where to lay his head" (Mt. 8 20 = Lk. 9 58) may well be a proverbial saying, used in the sense of the parallel utterance of Tiberius Gracchus regarding Rome's homeless veterans. It is difficult to conceive it in the mouth of Jesus, whose experience of generous hospitality both for himself and his disciples makes him promise them repeatedly (Mt. 10 11 = Lk. 10 5-7; Mk. 10 30) a kindly reception, and who refers afterward to their having received it (Lk. 22 35). The utterance seems improbable in Jesus' mouth because contrary to fact. But even at the early period of the Second Source we must allow for an occasional 'winged word' being ascribed to Jesus without better reason than resemblance in some catchword such as "Son of Man". The expression is here used, of course, in antithesis with the animal creation.

(2) The contrast of the mode of life of "the Son of Man" with that of John the Baptist (Mt. 11 19 = Lk. 7 34) is generally recognized as exhibiting one of the unhistorical occurrences of the title, for reasons already set forth.

(3) In the same context the title recurs again in the saying which makes "the Son of Man" a sign to "this generation" as Jonah had been to the Ninevites (Mt. 12 40 = Lk. 11 30). The "sign of the Son of Man" seems to have been a conception of current Jewish apocalypse. Whether connected with this expectation or not the present demand was met in various ways in early Christian apologetic (cf. Mt. 21 23-32 and parallels, Jn. 2 18-22; 6 30 ff.). The Q context which denounces the "evil and adulterous generation" that seeks this "sign" (Mt. 12 38-42 = Lk. 11 29-32), makes it probable that the discourse in its original form referred to a double insensibility. The evil generation had been deaf to a two-fold appeal. God had sent the Baptist like a second Elijah, warning of judgment to come and summoning to repentance, but in vain. The Ninevites at the threat of Jonah "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be destroyed" had repented in sackcloth and ashes. But the Pharisees and scribes, though they saw all the people and the publicans baptized with the baptism of John, did not even repent themselves afterwards, at this evidence of divine forbearance (Mt. 21 31 f. = Lk. 7 29 f.). Therefore in the day of judgment the Ninevites would put them

to shame. This, however, was but the first count in the indictment. The scribes had further sinned against the Spirit when, witnessing the "glad tidings" of mercy and forgiveness proclaimed by Jesus and corroborated by "the Spirit of God" visibly expelling the powers of darkness, they had objected, "He casteth out by Beelzebub". The gentle voice of mercy and tenderness, wooing the erring to return in this "glad tidings to the poor", was the very voice of "the Wisdom of God", whose loving condescension in going forth to seek and to save the lost is justified by her children. This is a greater 'wisdom' than Solomon's. Therefore the Queen of the South, who came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon would in the day of judgment put to shame those who had despised it. God has sent "prophets and wise men", but Israel has rejected both. In this double condemnation it cannot be "the Son of Man" who was originally set in parallelism with Jonah as the proclaimer of judgment to come. It can only have been (as elsewhere in Jesus' replies to the demand for a sign) John the Baptist, the forerunner of the judgment day, turning Israel to repentance "in the spirit and power of Elijah". Solomon, not Jonah, stands in parallelism with Jesus. We therefore owe the introduction of the title "the Son of Man" in Mt. 12 40 = Lk. 11 30 to a misunderstanding. The author of the Source in the form in which it lay before Matthew and Luke, certainly a Greek document, though probably translated from an Aramaic original, has endeavored to adjust the saying from a form like that of Mt. 16 4 or Mk. 8 12, where no mention is made of "the Son of Man", to a form consistent with his own idea of "the sign of the Son of Man". Even so Matthew and Luke take different views of the meaning.

(4) The last of the four occurrences of the title in Q is in the context already brought into connection with the preceding. In the discourse just described as a denunciation of the "evil and adulterous generation" which had rejected both forms of the divine appeal, warning of judgment or assurance of forgiveness, Jesus calls it a "blasphemy of the Spirit" to ascribe his works of beneficence to collusion with Beelzebub, because the power is not his own, but "the Spirit of God". Were they

speaking against him as a mere son of man (that is, a man like other men) this would be pardonable. But the sin of the scribes cannot be forgiven, because this is the last and Great Repentance, and they have used their power as holders of the key of knowledge to hinder those who were just entering the kingdom. They cannot frustrate the work of God, but they do cut themselves off from all part in the coming redemption. In this case we have perhaps a historical use of the generic term "a son of man"; but the context itself makes clear the fact that no title is intended. The term has simply its ordinary sense, a human being, a mere mortal, as opposed to "the Spirit of God".

The result of this individual study of the eight occurrences of the title Son of Man in Q is quite striking. Four, which all belong to the same type, that is, objective warnings of the Day, or the sudden Coming, of the heavenly Judge, we have no reason to question; for they go no further than the utterances of the Baptist, save that they bring "the Coming one" of whom John speaks into relation with the figure of Dan. 7 13 and later apocalyptic writers, by use of the special term "the Son of Man". The other four occurrences are of different types. All are subject to the historical objection that they could not have been employed as represented in the Source without provoking opposition such as does not appear to have been actually raised until the last days of the ministry, when Jesus faced it and suffered the consequences. Individually they show that they do not fit the contexts in which they occur. On the contrary they can be easily accounted for as extensions of the actual usage of Jesus in accordance with the prepossessions of the evangelist.

In passing to the fourteen occurrences of Mark we must be prepared to find on the one hand a certain proportion of authentic instances (whether from oral tradition or written sources, including among the latter some form of the Second Source), and on the other hand an extension due to the evangelist himself, in the same line as that already observed in Q. For if the example were once set, whether in Q or elsewhere, there would be every reason to expect later evangelists to follow

it, seeing all were thoroughly imbued with the idea that Jesus, even in the days of his flesh, had all the attributes of the heavenly dispenser of divine justice. It is of course no more than a coincidence, but certainly a significant coincidence, that again in Mark one-half the total number of occurrences, or seven in all, belong to a single group or type, for which we have every reason to posit some authentic and historical utterance, whereas the other half give evidence in various ways of being due to extensions on the part of the evangelist of earlier usage.

The seven occurrences characteristic of Mark are all distinguished by their common reference to the Betrayal, and are usually couched in the Isaian terminology employed by Paul (Rom. 4 25; 8 32), which speaks of the Servant as "delivered up" (*παρεδόθη*; not *προεδόθη*, as would be appropriate for betrayal). The prediction is first made in Mk. 8 31 = Lk. 9 22, in this single instance the language (*ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι*) reflecting Ps. 118 22 rather than Is. 53 6 LXX. (*κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν*). It is repeated in Mk. 9 31 and 10 33, referred to as a prophecy of Scripture in 9 12 and 14 21a, and as fulfilled by Judas in 14 21b and 14 41f. In all these cases, as also in 3 19 and 14 18, where the betrayal is spoken of without the title Son of Man, the verb employed is the Isaian *παραδίδοσθαι*. It seems reasonable to infer that the prediction is derived from some source in which Jesus' career was brought into parallelism with the work and fate of the Isaian 'Servant of Jehovah'; for in Mark itself no such parallel is attempted, though it can be traced in certain elements of the underlying material and is a distinctive theme of Luke. Whatever the source, it is not permissible to set aside such a series of occurrences as having no historical foundation. There is the less occasion for such radical scepticism from the fact that every one of the seven employments is represented as occurring in discourse addressed privately to the Twelve, and either at the revelation of Caesarea Philippi or later. It can at least be set down as one of the characteristics of Markan usage that wherever this evangelist has occasion to place in Jesus' mouth a reference to his anticipated fate he prefers to introduce the title "Son of Man" along with phraseology which recalls the classic passage of Is. 53 6 LXX.

Of the remaining seven Markan occurrences three merely reproduce in substance an utterance which we have already had occasion to consider in studying the usage of Q, and have pronounced beyond reasonable objection on the score of authenticity. In Mk. 13 26 we have the same impersonal, objective assurance of the Coming of the Son of Man in the conventional terms of current apocalypse as in the Q eschatology of Lk. 17 20–37 and parallels. The same prediction is made in similar terms in Mk. 8 38 and 14 62. To the evangelist Mark these are of course so many "self-designations of Jesus". But inherently they carry no such implication. As to their probable basis of fact we must enquire later.

There remain four occurrences of the title in Mark which we have good reason to regard as due to the evangelist himself for reasons which would naturally commend themselves from his point of view.

In Mk. 1 40—3 6 we have a section which corresponds in general bearing with the Q discourse already described, that is, the discourse à propos of the coming of the messengers from John to ask "Art thou He that should come?", when Jesus rebukes the Pharisees and scribes for their captious objections to his message of mercy and his genial mode of life. In Mark as in Q Jesus vindicates both his message of "glad tidings to the poor", and his freedom from the fasts and Sabbaths of Mosaism by appeal to his mighty works. The chief difference is that whereas in Q "the works of the Christ" are appealed to as evidences of the present operation of the divine Spirit, a proof that the power of the "strong man armed" is broken, in Mark Jesus is himself the Stronger one. He proves his own power by miracle, and thus defends his own superhuman authority. He pronounces sins forgiven, not as in Lk. 7 36–50 because he sees the effects of the divine Spirit on the penitent, but because as "Son of Man" he is himself endowed with this authority even while still "on earth". Finally he substantiates it by a word of power (Mk. 2 5–10). Similarly his disregard of fasts and Sabbaths is sustained by the bald declaration that "he is the Son of Man" (Mk. 2 28; verse 27, wanting in Daceffit and Matthew and Luke, is not part of the authentic text). As

we have seen, Q also, in two instances, both unhistorical, uses the title Son of Man in the discourse on John as Elias. But Mark has carried this extension further. The representation is not only incompatible with Jesus' reserve on the question of his personality, but is almost diametrically opposed to his authentic teaching as regards appeal to "signs". It is certainly in Q rather than in Mark that we get the real appeal of Jesus to the "mighty works". To Jesus these were not proofs of his personal authority as Son of Man on earth, but evidences of the present working of "the Spirit of God" which confirmed the "glad tidings". In Q "the works of the Christ" are those of the Isaian Servant. He does them in fulfilment of the calling Is. 42 1-4.

In Mk. 9 9, the command of secrecy until after the resurrection, and 10 45, a contrast of the self-abasement of the Servant as against the self-seeking of the Twelve, the context would naturally suggest to an evangelist imbued with the idea that Jesus used this title as a "self-designation" that it was more appropriate than the simple personal pronoun. In Mt. 11 19 = Lk. 7 34 and Lk. 19 10 we have examples of the schematic employment exhibited in Mk. 10 45. These examples themselves may have lain before the eyes of Mark in the Second Source.

We must therefore pass the same verdict on the usage of our second evangelist as on that of his predecessor. Half his employments of the title go back to an authentic utterance of Jesus, the nature of which is still to be studied. Of the remainder three represent an authentic utterance already represented in Q, four seem to be extensions of earlier use on the evangelist's own responsibility.

In considering the "single tradition" of Matthew and Luke respectively we must of course anticipate the same sort of phenomena as hitherto. Each evangelist has doubtless a certain amount of Second Source material which escapes classification under the symbol Q merely because one of our two witnesses omitted it, whether through preference of a Markan parallel, or merely because it seemed unsuited to his purpose. Such source-material must be brought if possible into relation with utterances of the same type already considered, but must above

all be sharply distinguished from material which shows the evangelist's own usage, if such there be.

In the case of Luke we may acknowledge at once our inability to detect any distinctive usage of the evangelist's own. There are eight occurrences of the title in Luke where the parallels do not record it and one in which Luke has the support of Mark but not of Matthew, who in this case uses the personal pronoun. This last is simply the prediction of Mk. 8 31 = Lk. 9 22, "The Son of Man must suffer many things and be rejected". Here the Matthean parallel, Mt. 16 21 makes a new beginning: "From that time Jesus began to show to his disciples that he must suffer", etc. After having begun in this way had Matthew written "the Son of Man must suffer" it would have seemed to imply a distinction between "Jesus" and "the Son of Man". Instead of this he recasts Mk. 8 38 (= Q Mt. 10 32f. = Lk. 12 8f.) in a way to remove all ambiguity: "For the Son of Man is about to come in the glory of his Father", etc. The omission is therefore probably intentional. At all events the title stood originally in Mark. Luke did not interject it. The eight instances, however, in which Luke stands alone are equally far from showing any disposition on this evangelist's part to introduce employments of the title on his own account, in the interest of a conception of his own. Once (Lk. 6 22) he speaks of obloquy endured "for the Son of Man's sake" where the Matthean parallel (Mt. 5 11) is probably truer to the source (Q) in writing "for my sake". Wellhausen suspects a translation error "*men* will cast upon you an evil name". More probably the change is a stylistic improvement of Luke. The obloquy was endured because of the disciples' faith in Jesus as "the Son of Man" (cf. Hegesippus ap. Eusebius, *H. E.* II, xxiii. 13). We may suspect a similar stylistic improvement in the promise of Jesus to acknowledge before the heavenly Judge those who have acknowledged him before earthly judges (Lk. 12 8 = Mt. 10 32). The Matthean parallel has simply the personal pronoun "I will confess", where Luke writes "The Son of Man will confess". In both these cases, it is true, the substitution could be ascribed to the precanonical evangelist, though in that case we should expect to find it in Matthew as well as Luke. In any case

the original meaning of the saying seems to ascribe to Jesus the function of witness, rather than judge, at the heavenly tribunal. "I will confess" is therefore more likely to be original, especially as the tendency of Matthew is to multiply occurrences.

A further group of three occurrences in the Lukan 'single tradition' (Lk. 17 22, Desire for "one of the days of the Son of Man"; 18 8, "If the Son of Man came would he find the faith on the earth?", and 21 36, "Watch, so as to stand before the Son of Man") belong to the class already described as characteristic of a part of the Q material, and as probably reflecting an actual usage of Jesus. They are mere general, impersonal, references to the Day, or the Coming, of the Son of Man, the expected agent of divine retribution. "One of the days of the Son of Man" in Lk. 17 22 is shown by the context to be probably a mistranslation for "the Day of the Son of Man", which is the object of longing as usually represented in the Source. Lk. 18 8 should be rendered as above. The meaning is: An immediate coming to judgement would give no opportunity for the proclamation of the Gospel, which must, according to the accepted view (Mk. 13 10; Acts 1 6–8), precede the consummation. Lk. 21 36 merely summarises editorially Mk. 13 33–37. The evangelist uses the title in a perfectly appropriate way in referring to the Coming. These three occurrences, accordingly, display no distinctive conception introduced by Luke. They merely show his acceptance of the idea of Q that Jesus employed the conventional term as a self-designation in the current sense, viz, the Agent of divine retribution.

Two occurrences in what would appear to be the Lukan 'single tradition' really represent in slightly different location the Marcan references to the Betrayal of "the Son of Man" already spoken of. Thus Lk. 22 48, "Betrayest thou (παραδίδως) the Son of Man with a kiss?", is simply repeated from Lk. 22 22 and is the true equivalent, so far as source is concerned, of Mk. 14 21 = Mt. 26 24. Again Lk. 24 7 is the reminder from the two angels at the tomb, of Jesus' prediction "when he was yet in Galilee, how that the Son of Man must be delivered up (παραδοθῆναι) into the hands of sinful men"; in other words it simply repeats Mk. 9 31 = Mt. 17 22 = Lk. 21 27. These two

occurrences may possibly strengthen somewhat the claim of this Marcan use to rest upon pre-Marcan tradition. They certainly confirm the evidence of Lk. 6 22 and 12 8 to a slight tendency on the part of our third evangelist to introduce the title for stylistic reasons, though he makes no change in the sense it bears in his sources. But they furnish no new instance for the usage of Jesus. They merely add to the evidence of the previously noted Marcan occurrences which show a certain disposition to use the title "the Son of Man" in connection with the prediction of Jesus that he would be "delivered up" (*παραδοθήσεται*).

Finally we have one occurrence in the Lukan 'single tradition' of what we have called the schematic use illustrated in the Q material by the summary: "The Son of Man came eating and drinking" (Mt. 11 19 = Lk. 7 34), and in Mark by the summary: "The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister" (Mk. 10 45 = Mt. 20 28). The declaration of Lk. 19 10 "The Son of Man came to seek and to save the lost" has precisely the same schematic character as the Q utterance. Unfortunately we have no more means of proving derivation from the Second Source in the case of Lk. 19 10 than in the case of Mk. 10 45. Both might be due to this Source, but in neither case have we the means of proving it; because our means of identification disappears in the case of what Mark has drawn from it, just as it does in the case where Luke has drawn from it without the coincident support of Matthew and non-support of Mark. If the story of Zacchaeus (Lk. 19 1-10), which winds up with the formula "the Son of Man came", be attributed to the Second Source (to which the present writer sees no insuperable objection) it must be by other reasoning than the usual application of the mechanical formula: Mt+Lk—Mk—single-tradition = Q.

Thus the eight occurrences of the title in the 'single tradition' of Luke furnish no single instance of employment in any other mode or connection than those already illustrated in the usage of Q and Mark. Some corroboration of the evidence of these earlier sources is furnished by them. They also show a slight tendency to increase the number of instances by stylistic

extension on the part of the evangelist. But for reliable evidence as to the actual usage of Jesus we must fall back upon Q and Mark; and even in these oldest sources we must distinguish between the usage representing authentic tradition, and the usage of the particular writer.

Lastly we have to consider the nine occurrences in the 'single-tradition' material of Matthew. One of these, the insertion of the title in the question of Mk. 8 27, "Who do men say that I am?" to make the impossible form of Mt. 16 13: "Who do men say that I, the Son of Man, am?" (corrected in some texts to "that the Son of Man is", in Syr. Sin. to "What do men say concerning me that I am, saying, Who is this Son of Man?") is a clear case of editorial addition. Two other passages make similar extension of the Marcan use. Mt. 16 28 = Mk. 9 1 repeats the expression from the preceding verse (Mt. 16 27 = Mk. 8 38) transforming the Marcan phrase "till they see the kingdom of God come with power" into "till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom". Similarly Mt. 26 2 interjects it in the parallel to Mk. 14 1, by anticipation of 26 24 f. = Mk. 14 21. In these two cases we have again quite certainly editorial extensions. The three together show the usual disposition to multiply instances, but the last two have slight bearing on the problem of the usage of Jesus, because we already have evidence for both types of employment. We know that Mark systematically uses this phraseology with reference to the Betrayal. We also know that Jesus did employ the term with reference to the Day of Jehovah, the Coming of his agent for the 'restoration of all things' (ἀποκατάστασις πάντων). Similar considerations apply in two other occurrences of the Matthean 'single-tradition'. (1) Mt. 24 30, where in transcribing Mk. 13 25 f. our evangelist interjects (after the prediction of wonders in the heavens introducing the promise "Then shall they see the Son of Man coming with clouds") the supplement "And then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven". This is clearly Matthew's own addition, showing his idea of the 'sign of the Son of Man'. Still employment of the term in such an objective, impersonal way would not conflict with what we have seen must have been true of the usage of Jesus. There is also (2) a reference to

the Coming of the Son of Man in the same impersonal, objective way in Mt. 10 23, where the disciples are assured that there will be no need to flee to foreign cities because "the cities of Israel" will afford them refuge "till the Son of Man be come". These two instances of Matthean 'single-tradition' are probably the evangelist's own. But they do not conflict with the acknowledged usage of Jesus.

From these five instances out of the nine of Matthean 'single tradition' very little is to be gained beyond a minimal corroboration of points already established. It does appear, however, that our first evangelist has a decided propensity for the term, even going so far in Mt. 26 2 as to transform the mere note of time of Mk. 14 1 into a prophecy placed in the mouth of Jesus which embodies the mysterious "self-designation". This propensity is further exemplified in Matthew's transcription of Mk. 8 38 = Mt. 16 27. To Mark's reference to the Coming of the Son of Man "in the glory of his Father with the holy angels" Matthew makes the supplement based on Ps. 62 13 (cf. *Enoch* lxiii. 9): "And then shall he render unto every man according to his work". When we pass to the remaining four occurrences of the title in Matthean 'single tradition' it will be seen how typically this addition represents the Matthean conception of Jesus as "the Son of Man".

This final group of distinctively Matthean occurrences is instructive. Not because it has any claim to represent the usage of Jesus, for in every case the material of the context can be shown by the stereotyped phraseology no less than the highly characteristic motive to be the handiwork of the evangelist himself. But the smaller its claims to historicity the more instructive as to redactional usage. This group of utterances placed by 'Matthew' in the mouth of Jesus is typical of the gradual building up of the impressive total on which a large part of insufficiently critical inference has been based. When analyzed as to the respective proportion of authentic tradition and redactional usage these eighty-one occurrences of the "self-designation" make a different impression. Lukan usage merely repeats that of Q. Matthean usage is characteristic in the highest degree of the special interests of the Palestinian Gospel

of neo-legalism. This evangelist imports into the usage of Jesus the apocalyptic sense of the term in *Enoch*, with special predilection for the apparatus of the "throne of glory" (this element appears in every one of the four), and the pronouncing of the eternal verdict from the heavenly judgment seat. Matthew emphasizes to the utmost the rewards of eternal blessedness in the kingdom prepared for the righteous from the foundation of the world, and the punishments of eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels which are to be the lot particularly of the teachers and workers of "lawlessness". Matthean usage is therefore a very definite fact, and one which merits comparison with the special nature of the compilation as a whole.

The so-called Gospel according to Matthew has specially in view the "teaching all men everywhere to obey all things whatsoever Jesus had commanded" (Mt. 28 20). Its general structure is like that of the Torah, five bodies of precept, each closing with a special formula (Mt. 7 28; 11 1; 13 53; 19 1 and 26 1) and prefaced by a narrative setting. These are drawn in most cases principally from Mark, though in the case of the third (11 2—12 45) principally from the Second Source. A prologue (1 1—2 23) and an epilogue (26 1—28 20) form an external historical framework. This general structure of Matthew justifies the designation 'Gospel of neo-legalism'. But in addition every one of its five bodies of teaching closes with a more or less direct forecast of the judgment of the Son of Man, with its reward for the righteous and penalties of eternal torment for the wicked. The fullest and most typical of these is that which brings the entire public ministry to a vivid close with the parable (recognized by even so conservative an interpreter as W. C. Allen in the *International Critical Commentary*, as the handiwork of the evangelist himself) of "the Son of Man" sitting upon "the throne of his glory" and administering the divine justice upon "all nations" according to their works, "as a shepherd divideth the sheep from the goats" (Mt. 25 31-46).

(1) A similar picture, warning of the fate of the "false prophets" (known by their lack of "good fruits" and destined to be "hewn down and cast into the fire") is prefixed to the closing parable of the first discourse (Mt. 7 13-23), the Lukan

parallel (Lk. 6 43-45; 13 23-27) showing that Matthew is here combining two Q discourses into a special warning against the teachers of "lawlessness". The specific title "Son of Man" does not here occur, but the description by which Jesus is made to speak of himself as sitting on the heavenly judgment seat is identical with that used elsewhere.

(2) The brief promise of reward in heaven which closes the Charge to the Twelve in Mt. 10 40-42 also lacks specific mention of "the Son of Man", but corresponds for substance with the fuller promise of the final parable (25 31-46).

(3) The Teaching in Parables (Mt. 13 1-52) expands the corresponding Marcan discourse (Mk. 4 1-34) by the addition of a group of three brief parables all concerned with heavenly reward. These are: Treasure-trove (13 44), The Pearl of great Price (13 45f.), and The Sorting of the Fish (13 47-50). The picture painted in this seventh and closing parable should be compared with that of the final judgment at the end of the fifth and closing discourse (13 49f.; cf. 41-43; 22 13; 25 30, 41 and Lk. 13 28f.):

> So shall it be in the end of the world; the angels shall come forth, and sever the wicked from among the righteous, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth.

Besides this expansion by additions to the Marcan group at its close and one (the Leaven, 13 33) which the Lukan parallel (Lk. 13 20f.) suggests was a companion parable in Q to that of the Mustard-seed, the total being thus raised to seven, Matthew has a great expansion of the parable of the Patient Husbandman (Mk. 4 26-29), transforming it into The Wheat and the Tares (Mt. 13 24-30), a companion-piece to The Good and Bad Fish and The Sheep and the Goats. Besides the parable itself a long and detailed Interpretation of the Parable (13 36-43) is also added in 'Matthew's' characteristic phraseology, ending:

> As therefore the tares are gathered up and burned with fire; so shall it be in the end of the world. The Son of Man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that cause stumbling and them that do

lawlessness, and shall cast them into the furnace of fire: there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.

(4) The discourse on Church-administration (Mt. 18) ends with the parable of the Unforgiving Debtor, whose "lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due". The application is: "So shall also my heavenly Father do unto you, if ye forgive not every one his brother from your hearts" (cf. the supplement Mt. 6 14f.).

(5) The final discourse, three chapters in length (Mt. 23—25), is all concerned with eschatology, and supplements Q material, urging prompt repentance in view of the coming judgment (25 1-13; cf. Lk. 13 25; Mk. 13 35-37 and 25 14-20 = Lk. 19 12-25). It closes with the sublime picture of the Son of Man sitting on the heavenly judgment seat and pronouncing sentence on all nations (25 31-46) to which reference has already been made. With these five endings of the 'Sermons' of Matthew should be compared his supplements to the Q parables of the Great Supper (Mt. 22 1-14 = Lk. 14 16-24) and the Talents (Mt. 25 14-30 = Lk. 19 12-27). No doubt will remain as to Matthean 'tendency'. Comparison of the phraseology of the three most peculiarly Matthean of the four (Mt. 13 37, 41 and 25 31) will explain the variation from Lukan phraseology in the case of the fourth (Mt. 19 28 = Lk. 22 29f.). In this case the Second Source spoke of "thrones of judgment", but not of "the Son of Man".

This survey of the 'single-tradition' material of Matthew in which his four individual employments of the title Son of Man are found, always in connection with mention of the "throne of glory" and usually of the "angels" who execute the sentence, should be conclusive as to the distinctive usage of this evangelist. They manifestly represent an extension of the evangelist's own in the direction already evidenced in Q. According to 'Matthew' Jesus in his public utterances, and from the very outset, spoke of himself freely as the agent of the divine judgment of mankind. He not only referred objectively to the Day of the Son of Man, the Coming of the Son of Man, and the like, but used the

title as a "self-designation" about which there was no mystery whatever. In his opening discourse he said in so many words (Mt. 7 22):

> Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy by thy name, and by thy name cast out demons, and by thy name do many mighty works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from me, ye that work lawlessness.

This is not merely an explicit reversal of the principle enunciated in Mk. 9 38-40, it not merely denies the toleration expressed by Mark for the professed Christian teacher and wonder-worker unless he be sound on the issue of "lawlessness" vs. "good works", but is itself embodied in a manifest editorial recast of the Q material of Lk. 13 26 f. Matthew applies the Q saying to the case of Christian "false prophets" whose pretensions are based on professions of loyalty and gifts of the Spirit, but who have not the indispensable guarantee of good works. In the original form (Lk. 13 23-30) it was addressed to those who count on admission to the messianic kingdom because of a mere outward association or racial connection with the "Master of the house" (who in the parable exercises the functions of the Son of Man; cf. Mt. 25 11 f. with Lk. 13 25). The Q phrases "weeping and gnashing of teeth", "cast forth without" are appropriate to this connection. Matthew has stereotyped them into a regular refrain. In reality they carry out the sense of the answer, "I know you not whence ye are". The Q original is equivalent to the Baptist's warning not to begin to say "We are Abraham's seed" (Mt. 3 9 = Lk. 3 8). The meaning is "If you work iniquity (ἀδικία) it makes no difference whether you are from Jerusalem, and descendants of the Patriarchs, or from the ends of the earth". Again we have a clear instance of editorial recasting of Q by 'Matthew', showing his special antipathy and exhibiting in its true colors his idea of how Jesus used the conception (and consequently the title as well) of "the Son of Man". It shows us little of the actual usage of Jesus, but much of the presuppositions which led to a gradual extension of the term into Gospel usage in the later period of Synoptic tradition.

Our survey of all the occurrences of the title Son of Man in Synoptic tradition is now complete. All may be classified in a small number of groups according as they represent actual tradition, or extensions of the transmitted usage in accordance with certain definable prepossessions of the particular writer. The 'single tradition' of 'Matthew' exhibits a very marked extension on the part of this particular evangelist. 'Luke' merely adds slightly to the number of occurrences by occasional stylistic employments. Mark and the Second Source alone offer employments from which some fairly reliable inferences may be drawn as to the real usage of Jesus. In each case we have one mode of employment which may be regarded as belonging to the tradition rather than to the writer himself because it occurs with such frequency, is supported by the testimony of other writers, and is not attributable to any particular idiosyncracy of the writer.

(1) In the Q material as well as in all later and dependent tradition (including Mark) we find evidence which it would require arguments more cogent than any known to the present writer to set aside, that Jesus made use of current expressions such as the Day, or the Coming, of the Son of Man, with reference to the agent of divine retribution predicted by John the Baptist in the phraseology "He that cometh after me to purge his threshing floor", or more briefly "He that should come". But this alone will hardly account for the difference between the usage ascribed by the sources to John and that ascribed to Jesus, who alone is represented as using the title "Son of Man". Possibly the writer of the Second Source might be held responsible for this identification of the figure of Dan. 7 13 with the Baptist's 'Coming one'. But this supposition seems unnecessarily violent in view of the possibility made so apparent by Dalman that *Bar nasha* could have been used, even if it had not yet come to be widely used, in the sense: "the heavenly champion of Israel predicted by Daniel". At least the testimony of the Gospel sources beginning with Q is very strong that Jesus himself habitually referred to this 'Coming one' as "the Son of Man". But they also indicate "plainly enough" that he "avoided any messianic self-designation". The references are

impersonal and objective. They carry in substance the message: "Be ye ready for the Coming of the Son of Man; for the time of judgment and the visitation of Israel is near, of which John gave warning in the spirit and power of Elijah". It seems more reasonable, therefore, to ascribe this identification of the Coming one of the Baptist (the Angel of the Covenant of Ex. 23 20f. and Mal. 3 1—4 1) with the Son of Man of Dan. 7 13 to no other than Jesus himself.

(2) The usage of Mark has also a typical employment of the title Son of Man which gives evidence of being traditional rather than the outgrowth of the evangelist's own prepossessions. The fact that Mark alone has no fewer than seven instances of prediction by Jesus of his betrayal, in all of which he uses the title "Son of Man", six times out of the seven in conjunction with the Isaian and Pauline term παραδοθῆναι, while the single tradition of Matthew and Luke adds three further instances, strongly suggests an actual utterance of Jesus predicting this betrayal. Whether the connection of it with the fate of the suffering Servant of Is. 53 6 LXX as in I Cor. 15 3; Rom. 4 25 and elsewhere is due to Jesus himself, rather than to the earliest believers, seems much more doubtful. The evidence of Marcan usage (together with the extensions in Mt. 26 2 and Lk. 22 48 and 24 7) makes it highly probable that at a very early date (though probably later than Paul) the association became habitual. Consequently when the "delivering up" was spoken of the term naturally employed in conjunction with it would be "the Son of Man".

The characterization of this special usage as "Marcan" over against that of Q does not by any means imply that it was absent from the Second Source. On the contrary it may very well be derived by Mark from the Second Source, though in that case it would not appear in Q, because the definition of Q is "coincident material of Matthew and Luke *not contained in Mark*". The consecutive story of Mark does however, fortunately, enable us to bring the utterance into connection with a definite and specific occasion. It was when Jesus set his face at Caesarea Philippi to go up to Jerusalem, braving a probable martyrdom, that he began to predict this "delivering up", though the earlier

references speak not of Judas, but of the Jewish authorities as those who will "deliver up the Son of Man". It is only in "that same night in which he was delivered up" (παρεδίδοτο, I Cor. 11 23) that one of the Twelve is named as the agent.

The curious thing about this usage, which habitually associates the term "Son of Man" with references to the "delivering up", is that Son of Man is almost the last expression we should expect to be so used. The title to be expected in the Marcan group of references is "the Servant", a title which we only know from a few passages in the Petrine speeches of Acts (2 13, 26; 4 27, 30) and half a dozen occurrences in patristic writings from 95 to 195 A. D., *particularly in passages relating to the sacrament, or the sacrificial death of Jesus.* It must therefore have once had a certain currency; but this it subsequently lost, the form "Thy elect (or "beloved") Servant" becoming "The elect (or "beloved") Son". In Isaiah it is the 'Servant' who is "delivered up". The 'Son of Man' is not an Isaian term, and the use of it which we have found to be most surely attributable to Jesus is as remote as possible from those connected with the "delivering up". Is there any way in which this paradoxical Marcan use can be accounted for?

The ordinary reply to this question pleads the value of paradox itself. Jesus is supposed to have aimed at this very contrast. The heavenly Champion of Israel who obtains their vindication and eternal dominion over wicked oppressors is the very same as he whom they rejected and delivered up. The plea would be cogent if applied to those who looked back from after the resurrection; but for Jesus it was first of all imperative to teach the doctrine of the Servant. The Synoptic writers might well effect in their minds this combination; but it does not seem to represent very well the mind of Jesus. The attitude of Jesus toward his own fate is surely that of the Servant, obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. He goes to meet it not as one who understands, and confidently treads the path to victory, but as one who in faith accepts the cup extended by the Father, trusting though he slay him. It does appear, however, and that not by the testimony of Mark alone, but by the coincident testimony of Q, of Mark,

and of one of the "faithful sayings" of the primitive Church (II Tim. 2 11-13) that in connection with this same prediction of "delivering up" Jesus also gave assurance of vindication for his cause, and for all who maintained their loyalty to it in spite of "trials". This vindication would be *in the Day of the Son of Man.*

For the promise of this ultimate divine vindication is historically indissociable from the prediction of the "delivering up". Even if Mark had not so explicitly made the connection in 8 34—9 1 we should have been obliged to infer something of the kind in order to account for the facts of the later story. The "faithful saying" of II Tim. 2 11-13 parallels Lk. 22 28-30, suggesting the farewell Supper as the true historical occasion. In Mk. 8 38 it is made part of the warning of the cross. But here the Roman evangelist shows clearly his use of a tradition coincident with the Second Source if not of the Second Source itself. The same promise is not only repeated by the later Synoptists in transcribing Mark (Mk. 8 38 = Mt. 16 27 = Lk. 9 44) but independently in Mt. 10 32f. = Lk. 12 8f. This Q form of the promise which Mark brings into direct connection with the prediction of the "delivering up" (thus as it were marking the beginnings of the equivalence "The Servant = the Son of Man") has so much to do with the origins of Marcan usage that we may take the liberty of placing the Matthean and Lukan forms in parallel columns:

Mt. 10 32f.	Lk. 12 8f.
Whosoever then shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father who is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father who is in heaven.	Everyone who shall confess me before men, the Son of Man will also confess him before the angels of God. But he who has denied me before men shall be denied before the angels of God.

Here the reference is manifestly to the scene of Dan. 7 13. Our two witnesses differ as to whether the Second Source used the title Son of Man or not. To both of them that is a matter of indifference because in their view "the Son of Man" was a

"favorite self-designation of Jesus". Matthew's complete recast of Mk. 8 38—9 1 (= Mt. 16 27f.) shows clearly enough his idea of the promise. Jesus himself sitting on the throne of glory will render the verdict, as depicted in the parables (see above, p. 170). In Luke this is quite uncertain. The idea may be only "I will witness at God's judgment seat, for those who have witnessed for me in the face of earthly judges"; but as regards the extent of Jesus' use (not the content) Luke takes the same ground as Matthew and Mark. All three probably represent in this the usage of the Second Source. But why should the Second Source introduce the term if it was not in reality characteristic of Jesus? Two phenomena, typical respectively of the Q usage and that of Mark, are worthy of our attention at this point, and may throw some light upon the question.

1. We have already called attention to the distinction to be drawn between a group of occurrences in Q which appear to represent authentic tradition, and others which we have good reason to believe are extensions due to a preconception of the precanonical evangelist. Jesus probably referred to the divine judgment of which the Baptist had forewarned as "the Day of the Son of Man". He probably did not draw the comparison between his own mode of life and that of the herald of judgment in the form: "John came ... the Son of Man came". In this respect the report of Q is probably misleading; for, as Harnack puts it, he had just before, in the same discourse "plainly enough avoided any messianic self-designation". The Source is therefore to some extent at odds with itself. What can account for this inner discrepancy?

The great Q discourse Mt. 11 2—12 45, when compared with its Lukan parallels shows as its principal motive condemnation of the Jewish leaders for their rejection of "the Christ" in spite of the correspondence of his ministry *with that foretold in Isaiah of the rejected and suffering Servant of Jehovah.* This is the point of the "avoidance of any messianic self-designation" in Jesus' reply to the question of John, who is told in substance to observe how the Isaian prophecy of the "consolation of Israel" is being fulfilled, and not to be stumbled if he sees no

sign of the Coming one he himself had predicted (Mt. 11 2-6; cf. Is. 35 3-6; 26 14 (the heathen say: "they are dead, they shall not live"), 19; 61 1f.). But the answer to John serves as a mere introduction to the main discourse, which takes up again the question of "the works of the Christ". And what they signify with reference to his own mission and personality. John had been near to "stumbling" because the works of the Servant were *not* what he had looked for in the Coming one. The actual "stumbling" of the scribes and Pharisees at this same work of blessing and grace among "the poor" is for Q the fulfilment of the divine "decree" (εὐδοκία) to hide these things from the wise and prudent and reveal them unto babes (Mt. 11 25-27 = Lk. 10 21f.; cf. Is. 29 9-14). For Q Jesus incarnates that "Wisdom of God" who is justified by her children, the "babes", or "little ones" of Is. 29 23f. (Mt. 11 19ff. = Lk. 7 34ff.). This is the Son who makes known the Father. His career is summed up by "Isaiah the prophet" when he gave his description of "the Servant whom I have chosen; the Beloved on whom I fixed my choice" (Mt. 12 17-21; cf. Mk. 1 2-4, 10f. and parallels). Such is the fundamental Christology of the Second Source. Its Christ is the Servant-Son of Dt.-Isaiah and Wisdom of Solomon.

The Q fragments come in different order in Matthew and Luke, and there are sections probably belonging to Q which only one of the two has embodied, but in whatever order restored, and however fragmentarily, it is manifest that the conception of "the Son" which to the author's mind corresponds with the real ministry of Jesus is that of the Isaian Servant. This is the great truth which the Baptist is encouraged to see, while Pharisees and Scribes remain wilfully blind to it. Jesus may, or may not be the Coming one whom John has looked for. He *is* the Servant-Son. The unhistorical use of "Son of Man" in Q, representing an extension on the redactor's part of the authentic, reflects the paradox above referred to. The writer thinks that Jesus could have said to the crowd "I decline to admit that I am the Coming one of John; however I freely acknowledge that I am the Son of Man". His own material reverses this. It implies that Jesus would have said: "You can see for yourselves if you do not resist the witness

of the Spirit, that my works are the works of the Servant. If that be your 'Coming one' be it so.

2. Curiously enough the same impression is made by the typical usage of Mark. It is the title "the Servant" which would be appropriate in all the instances which refer to the "delivering up". "Son of Man" offers an unexplained paradox. True we have the latter title in its proper sense where Jesus answers the challenge of the high priest to say whether he is "the Christ, the Son of the Blessed": "I am: and ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven". But the story of the Trial before the Sanhedrin (Mk. 14 55-64) belongs to those elements of the second Gospel which are most obviously redactional. The parallel in 15 1-5 is more historical. This occurrence should therefore be classed with Mk. 2 10 and 28 as one of the extensions of the evangelist. Only, no new content is imported into the title. In Mk. 14 62 as in 13 26 the evangelist merely reproduces the authentic use of Q (Mt. 24 37 ff. = Lk. 17 26 ff.).

But we have already seen reason to believe that the group of occurrences in Mark which speak of the "delivering up" of the Son of Man represent some older tradition. Just as in Mk. 1 11 and parallels "Son" is clearly substituted for "Servant" (cf. Mt. 12 18) so in this extensive group "Son of Man" seems to be used as in Q to mean the one who is now the Servant but will soon be manifested as the Coming one predicted by John. Now Mark shows little interest in the Isaian prophecy. It is only Luke who dwells upon the correspondence between the fate of Jesus and the predictions of Is. 53. It is therefore less probably our Mark than some source common to Mark and Luke which underlies the predictions of martyrdom in Mk. 8 31; 9 31; 10 33, the schematic statement in 10 45 with its counterpart in 14 24, and the references to prophecy in 9 12 (a doubtful passage) and 14 21. In the last named verses it is peculiarly infelicitous to use "the Son of Man" in referring to predictions which speak of the Servant, while no such prediction is anywhere made of "the Son of Man". Should not this peculiar use in Mark of the one title where we should most expect the other be placed alongside of the similar phenomenon in Q?

The typical Marcan usage just referred to appears to rest on earlier authority; but does it go back to Jesus himself? The fact that Paul refers to the prediction of Isaiah not as if Jesus had himself so declared, but merely as a primitive doctrine of the Church based upon "Scripture" (I Cor. 15 3) is rather opposed to this. But, as we have seen, it is impossible to hold that Jesus did not claim to be "the Christ". On the contrary it would be impossible without this to understand how the earliest witnesses came to think of his employment of the apocalyptic term Son of Man as a *self*-designation.

With the advancing shadow of the cross Jesus was driven to sustain both his own faith and his disciples' by increasing the proportionate emphasis on the transcendental aspect of the messianic hope, thus making the equivalence Son of David = Son of Man more and more unavoidable. He expressed his fearless confidence in the "good pleasure" (εὐδοκία) of the Father to give the Kingdom to his little flock. How, then, if not through their Leader? And if through a martyred Leader how otherwise than at the judgement seat of the Ancient of Days? The oldest Source records this unconquerable faith of Jesus through its version of the institution of the Supper, a version all the more significant from its complete independence of the Pauline (I Cor. 11 23-26) as well as the Marcan form (Mk. 14 22-26). The Q passage Lk. 22 28-30 = Mt. 19 28 records an interpretation of the bread and wine of the Covenant, supported, as we have seen, by allusions in I Cor. 6 3 and II Tim. 2 11-13, uttered in the same tone of heroic faith:

> Ye are they that have endured with me in my trials; and I covenant (διατίθεμαι) with you a kingdom, even as my Father covenanted with me (διέθετό μοι); that ye shall eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

Connection with Q has been denied to this passage on the ground that it is not in the spirit of the Second Source. Even were this true it would not affect the claim to authenticity, since the attestation is the same as for Q. In reality the objection rests on no better foundation than failure to recognize

an allusion to the "thrones of the house of David" of Ps. 122 4f. which was self-evident to Andreas of Caesarea. The words are of course symbolic, uttered in a tone of defiant exaltation in the face of death, intelligible only by reference to the scripture passages whose phraseology they adopt (II Sam. 9 7, 10, 13; Ps. 122 4f.). The Christology they reflect is that of the Son of David (cf. Acts 15 16-18; Didaché ix.). But their testimony cannot be set aside. Corroborated by that of the cross itself it shows that Jesus did perish as "King of the Jews".

We have indeed no need to show that Jesus' conception of the Kingdom was not "according to the things of men". Nevertheless, from Caesarea on, the hope of it was irrevocably linked to his own fate. Moreover it was to be given by God, not conquered by men. How else, then, can we imagine Jesus reassuring the Twelve that his own impending death would not frustrate God's design, if not by his pointing to the classic prophecy, where in vision Daniel sees the representative of down-trodden Israel brought to the heavenly judgment seat, not to dispense justice but to seek it, one "like unto a Son of Man" receiving on behalf of Jehovah's little flock "the everlasting dominion which shall not pass away". On the testimony of Mark we may well believe that Jesus himself in these days of preparation for the great tragedy spoke among his intimates those reassuring words pointing to the vision of Daniel which in due time were to be recalled as proof that all his earlier impersonal references to the coming of the Son of Man were mysterious "self-designations". The Matthean version of this same promise of reunion in the glories of the New Jerusalem, when compared with the simplicity of the Lukan form, is typical of the advance of apocalyptic Christology in the period of neo-legalism:

> Ye who have followed me, in the Regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit upon the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

Note. It is regrettable that the article "Did Jesus call Himself Son of Man?" in *The Journal of Religion* for September, 1922 should have appeared too late for consideration here. The author, Dr. Carl Patton, answers his own question in the negative.

THE PLACE OF APOCALYPTICAL CONCEPTIONS IN THE THOUGHT OF PAUL

FRANK C. PORTER
YALE UNIVERSITY

THE place of apocalyptical elements in the religion of a Jew or a Christian of the first century is not a merely historical problem, if by history we mean the study of sources and relationships. It is in every case a question also of interpretation, a psychological or a philosophical question, or perhaps one would better say a question of the personal quality and reaction. In the case of Paul the question is complicated, not only by peculiarities of his mind, but by the striking and distinctive quality in his religious experience. The resurrection of Christ was to Paul a fact of his own observation, and it was an eschatological event, and the first such event, as is clear in I Cor. 15 20-28. We have therefore to do in the case of Paul with one who regards last things as having already begun; and we shall see that there is involved in that fact a deep-going change in the signification of the apocalyptical ideas themselves. It is one thing to expect a supernatural intervention of God in the immediate future, the incoming of the heavenly world and its powers, bringing this present world to an end and bringing in the world to come, and quite another thing to believe that an event recently passed was the hoped for coming of God into the world, the overthrow of the powers of evil and the inauguration of the time of redemption and blessedness. Apocalyptical conceptions may no doubt be said to have an important place in the thought of a man who holds

this remarkable opinion, but the nature of apocalyptic hopes will be so transformed by such a conception of their fulfilment that the word can only be used with caution. To Paul, on account of the life, death and resurrection of Christ, all things had become new, including his fundamental conceptions of the other world itself, and of the nature of the dualism which in one sense or another is at the foundation of the apocalyptical view of the world. The new age had dawned and its powers were present and were experienced; Paul found himself a new being in a new world; and yet all things outwardly remained as they were. The other world must therefore be within and not beyond. A spiritualizing of the apocalyptical hope would be necessarily involved in the conviction that the new age was in a real sense present; and it would seem that nothing could be clearer than that in Paul apocalyptical conceptions have been in principle, whether more or less consciously, spiritualized. The new man that Paul feels himself to be is the man in whom spirit dominates over flesh, the man in whom love has overcome selfishness, who no longer lives to himself. Yet Paul is one who can look forward as well as backward for the coming of the Lord, and outward as well as inward. Though things are still outwardly as they were before Christ rose, while inwardly all things are new, yet they are not always to be outwardly the same. Paul does not question the primitive Christian expectation of the coming of Christ, although it is his past coming that is the supreme crisis in world history. The apocalyptical, therefore, comes into Paul's thought both as a means of interpreting the life and death and resurrection of Christ, and his present power as indwelling spirit to transform men's lives, and also as a hope for the speedy consummation of that redemption which is already a matter of experience. The central question that is before us therefore is that of the actual effect upon Paul's inherited ideas about the Day of the Lord and the World to Come, of Christ himself as a historical fact and as the present power of a new ethical life.

Whatever may be true about the eschatological ideas of Paul it is certainly true that he illustrates the fact that apocalyptical and spiritual conceptions can stand side by side

in one mind, apocalyptical and prophetic, we may perhaps say, and that the question is not between the one and the other but is a problem of the degree and manner of the relationship between the two. There is no doubt a strong tendency in common human minds to move from the prophetic to the apocalyptic, from the inner to the outer, from the spiritual to the miraculous; but the opposite movement is no less possible, and is to be expected in the case of greater men. We have a right to assume that men of great intellectual and moral nature and of creative influence in the spiritual history of man are in touch with realities in their thinking, rather than with myths and imaginations. Certainly in the case of Paul we are dealing with a very great man, with one also who had a very great experience which he could only speak of as a dying and living again. It is not unhistorical in the case of such a man to look for and expect to find transformations of outward things and of current opinions through which they become expressive of absolute values and universal human experiences.

Just now the tendency seems to be to emphasize the apocalyptical element in Paul and to regard every spiritualizing interpretation as an unhistorical modernizing of his modes of thought. This tendency has extreme expression in Schweitzer's *Paul and His Interpreters*.[1] In this "critical history" of the interpretation of Paul, Schweitzer finds the true view suggested only by Lüdemann (1872), and in Kabisch's *Die Eschatologie des Paulus* (1893), both of whom emphasize the objective, physical nature of redemption, and especially Kabisch the purely eschatological foundation and structure of Paul's thought. Schweitzer insists that Paul made no use whatever of Hellenistic ideas and that Jewish apocalyptic is the sole source and character of his Christianity. He labors especially to prove that the mysticism of Paul has nothing to do with Greek mysticism. The fundamental strain in it he insists was not ethical but physical. Although neither his mysticism nor his sacramentalism are Jewish, yet they have no touch of the Greek in them, and are to be understood as founded upon eschatology. Paul is one whose thought

[1] *Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung*, 1911. In English, 1912.

moves in the apocalyptic system created by the books of Daniel and Enoch. Schweitzer makes much use of the word *naturhaft*, and favors the translation of it by the word "physical", by which he means that body and soul are redeemed together, and that the whole world, the material universe, is to be transformed by a great catastrophic event. The clue to the understanding of Paul, he thinks, is to be found in the peculiar conditions of the brief intermediary period between the death of Jesus and the parousia, during which the natural and supernatural are both present in an unadjusted relationship to each other. The questions which he says we must answer in order to understand Paul are those that concern the scheme and order of the events of the end. They are such as the following: Are there two resurrections or one? one judgment or two? who rise at the parousia? does judgment take place then? who are judged, and by what standards, and in what do reward and punishment consist? what happens to those who are not destined to the Messianic kingdom? the fate of believers who fall by unworthy conduct,—can they lose their final blessedness, or are they only excluded from the Messianic kingdom? does Paul recognize a general resurrection, and if so when? when does the judgment take place at which the elect judge angels? Now it is not to be denied that Paul expresses opinions on some matters of this sort, although the fact that he leaves so many questions to be asked may itself indicate that he is not much concerned with the answers. But surely one who thinks that questions like these lead us to the heart of Paulinism lays himself open to the answer given most effectively by Reitzenstein, that he leaves not only Hellenism but Personality out of Paul, explaining him as a mechanical mixture of certain definite elements. It should, on the contrary, be the aim of the historian to grasp the personality of such a man as Paul and to understand him from himself, as well as from the environing world.[2] The one-sidedness of Schweitzer's interpretation is generally recognized. In fact the failure of any adequate appreciation of Paul casts suspicion back upon

[2] See Reitzenstein, *Religionsgeschichte und Eschatologie*, ZNTW, 1912, pp. 1—28.

Schweitzer's more influential effort to interpret the mind of Christ in exclusively apocalyptic terms. But there are others who feel justified in saying that Paul's outlook is at bottom that of Jewish apocalyptic.[3] Can this rightly be said, or in what measure is there truth in such a position?

If Jewish apocalyptical conceptions lie at the foundation of Paul's Christian thought we should expect evidence of it in his use of literature. As a matter of fact his use of the Old Testament shows no interest in the more apocalyptical types of prophecy. He interprets the Old Testament in a Christian sense, but does not seem concerned to find in it predictions of this or that detail of the life of Christ and the beginnings of Christianity, as do the writers of Matthew or Acts. He agrees with all Christians that Christ died for our sins and was buried and has been raised on the third day "according to the scriptures". But his chief concern is to read the Old Testament as a whole in such a way that it shall be seen to mean not Judaism and the Law but Christ and Christianity. The most important and difficult thing that Paul had to do in his Christianizing of the Old Testament was to justify his freedom from the law and the setting aside of Israel's peculiarity and prerogative. The bearing of his use of scripture on the question before us justifies our dwelling on the matter somewhat and noting his preferences. Paul's usual way of citing Scripture is with the use of the word γέγραπται. It is hard to be exact in enumerating the occurrences of this form of citation; but he uses it about thirty-six times, nine for citations from the Pentateuch, sixteen from the Prophets, and ten from the Psalms and Job, leaving I Cor. 2 9 for the present out of account. Of the thirty-five, eleven are from Isaiah and nine from the Psalms. Adding to these, other formulas of citation and also passages evidently quoted, though without any formula, we find thirty-four from the Pentateuch, thirty-three from the Prophets and twenty-nine from the Hagiographa. Of the thirty-three, twenty-two are from Isaiah, and of the twenty-nine, twenty-four are from the Psalms. Besides actual

[3] See for a recent example Morgan's *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, 1917, page 6.

citations there are of course other uses of Old Testament language. No list of such reminiscences or allusions can in the nature of the case be complete. For our present purpose we may take the phrases which Westcott and Hort print in uncial text in their edition, together with a few obvious additions. Including with these the citations proper, I find seventy-one references to the Pentateuch; five to the Former and ninety-eight to the Latter Prophets; and seventy-one to the Hagiographa. Of the ninety-eight, sixty-six are to Isaiah; and of the seventy-one forty-four are to the Psalms. Three-fourths of the whole number are from the Pentateuch, Isaiah and the Psalms. It is surely not simply an accident that Paul makes so little use of the more distinctively apocalyptical parts of the Old Testament. In the quotations proper there are none at all from Daniel. From Ezekiel there is only one, and that somewhat uncertain and of no significance. It is evident that Ezekiel did not interest Paul. From Zechariah there is one (8 16); but of the apocalyptical elements of this book Paul seems to have made no use. There is one citation from Joel (Rom. 10 13), again not eschatological. Among the allusions there is one to Daniel in that most apocalyptic of all sections of Paul's letters, the prediction of Antichrist in II Thes. 2 3-12 (compare 2 4 with Dan. 11 36 f.). Even those who are not doubtful of the authenticity of this book commonly agree that this apocalyptic fragment is as little "Pauline" and as evidently borrowed as any passage in his letters. It is certainly an extraordinary fact that the Book of Daniel, which has so important a place in the Gospels and Revelation, has practically no value to Paul in his search through the Old Testament for Christ. That he does not use it or reflect upon it seems to bear upon the obscure question of his knowledge of the title "Son of Man", and the special conceptions of the Messiahship and the parousia which belong to that title. Considering the frequency of Paul's references to the parousia and the closeness of the connection of this expectation in the Gospels with Daniel 7 13 and the name "Son of Man", the absence of the title in Paul's letters and his complete indifference to the Book of Daniel are surely significant. We are left then with this

result, that the apocalyptical literature which was certainly within Paul's reach and had the undoubted character of canonicity he did not care for; and that he was practically content, so far as literary helps were concerned, to argue for the truth of Christianity against Judaism from the Pentateuch, and to find Christian faith and experience expressed in the language of Isaiah and the Psalms.

We have now to consider the one passage in which Paul quotes with the words "as it is written" a saying which is not found in the Old Testament, namely I Cor. 2 9. According to Origen the saying was found in the Secrets of Elijah the Prophet, a non-extant Jewish apocalypse. For our present purpose it is enough to make two observations on this apparent exception to the rule that Paul shows no interest in apocalyptical literature. In the first place his introduction of the quotation with the words καθὼς γέγραπται, with which he uniformly quotes the Old Testament, makes one suspect that he intended here to quote Isaiah 64 4 LXX. But in the second place a study of the course of thought in I Cor. 1—3 will make it, I think, quite certain that Paul is not speaking here of things eschatological, but of the Gospel itself, that wisdom of God which has been hidden but is now revealed to those who have received the spirit of God. The "things which eye saw not, and ear heard not, and which entered not into the heart of man, whatsoever things God prepared for them that love him", were to Paul not things that are still future, but the things promised of old which Christians have now received. These are things that God freely gives, but which can be known only by the spiritual; and my own conviction is clear that Paul does not intend by the wisdom which he speaks "among the perfect" to indicate an esoteric gnosis, whether about eschatological or other mysteries, additional to and distinct from Jesus Christ and him crucified, who is to us "wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification, and redemption".

If Paul knew any uncanonical apocalypse it would be the Book of Enoch. His attitude toward Daniel makes us realize that he may have known Enoch very well and yet have cared nothing for it and made no use of it. Charles, in the Intro-

duction to his *Book of Enoch* (2 ed. § 19), says, "The influence of I Enoch on the New Testament has been greater than that of all the other apocryphal and pseudepigraphic books taken together". Then, after including the direct quotation of Enoch in Jude 14-15, the allusions to the fall of the angels in Jude and II Peter, and the probable connection of I Peter 3 19-20 with Enoch 10, without distinction, in a long list of unconvincing parallels in the Catholic Epistles and Revelation, he turns to Paul, who "as we know, borrowed both phraseology and ideas from many quarters", and says, "We shall find that he was well acquainted with and used I Enoch". The evidence follows, twenty-one passages quoted without comment or discrimination. They consist largely of such phrases as the following: Angels of powers and angels of principalities; He who is blessed forever; In His name they are saved; This present evil world; According to His good pleasure; Children of light, *etc.* It is of course evident that expressions like these give no proof whatever of literary use. They are often of a biblical character, or are so slight as to carry no weight. Indeed one suspects that the verbal likeness is often due to Charles' translation rather than to the original author. Only two of the parallels have any real interest, Enoch 62 15-16 has a real likeness to Paul's comparison of the resurrection body with a clothing from heaven in II Cor. 5 2-4, and to his conception of the spiritual body in I Cor. 15; and the light that appears on the face of the holy and righteous in Enoch 38 4, may well be compared with the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ of II Cor. 4 6. The likeness in thought is important, but Paul's language does not suggest literary relationship. Just now Dr. Rendel Harris (Expository Times, June 1922, p. 423) argues that Paul makes a direct reference to Enoch 38 4 in II Cor. 3 18, which he would read in accordance with Tertullian's apparent quotation from Marcion's New Testament, "as if from the Lord of Spirits", instead of (R. V.) "even as from the Lord the Spirit". This is an interesting suggestion, but it is by no means so certain as Dr. Harris thinks. This great verse in Paul is shaped by the account of Moses in Ex. 34 29-35 with which Paul has been

dealing from verse 7 on, and needs no further explanation. The reading of the Greek manuscripts (πνεύματος, never πνευμάτων), in spite of a certain difficulty, follows not unnaturally from the sentence "The Lord is the Spirit" in verse 17; and the substitution of the Enoch phrase "Lord of Spirits" in Marcion's text is not difficult to account for without the assumption of its originality.

Very much, of course, is to be learned about current views of the world in Paul's time, and so about his own views, from the apocalypse of Enoch, and still more from the later apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch. These to be sure date a generation after Paul's death, but they are not so remote as Enoch is from the ideas and spirit of Rabbinical Judaism, and could have arisen, one would think, within the circles of such rabbis as afterwards joined the final Messianic revolution under Hadrian. But the differences in every direction which Christ made in Paul's thought prevent our inferring from these books what Paul's answers would have been even to such questions as Schweitzer asks; still less can they teach us the actual significance of apocalyptical hopes in Paul's religion. If we can trace two movements in the New Testament, one towards a greater elaboration of apocalyptical expectations, from Q to Mark, from Mark to Matthew, from Matthew to Revelation, and the other away from the apocalyptic toward the spiritual apprehension of the other world and man's relation to it, we must certainly say that Paul stands near the beginning of the second of these movements, of which the issue is in the Gospel of John. Paul appears to be moving away from the apocalyptic interpretation of Christianity. Assenting to what primitive Christians held as to the speedy coming of the Lord, he was yet not deeply concerned with its external features. He was greatly interested in the heavenly world and in the future age, but when we ask in what sort of another and future world his life was centered it appears at once how fundamentally different his interests were from those of apocalyptic religion.

It would be interesting in this connection to compare the spirituality of Paul with that most spiritual of the apocalypses,

the Parables of Enoch. The word spirit is central in this writer's religion. God is the Lord of Spirits who has filled the world with spirits. The spirit world is not to be seen by men and can be known only by revelation through one who has been translated into it. Religion consists in faith in the reality of the hidden dwelling places of the righteous, in the Lord of Spirits, in the Divine Wisdom which also dwells there, having found no dwelling place on earth, and in the Son of Man and his future coming as judge. One who has faith in this unseen world will renounce the present evil world and all its works and ways. When this other world takes the place of the present, the righteous will be changed in nature into accordance with that world and will be clothed with garments of glory, garments of life from the Lord of Spirits, which shall not grow old. They will enjoy familiar companionship with that Son of Man, in a world in which there is nothing corruptible and from which all evil shall have passed away.

Paul also knows two worlds and knows that it is the religious task of man to have his real home in the heavenly world. He also has seen in vision this heavenly realm and the heavenly man who dwells there and who is to be judge of the world. But Paul knows who this heavenly pre-existent man is. He is the exalted Jesus, but still Jesus himself, who had just lived and died in Palestine. It is in the light of his personality that Paul interprets the heavenly world. It is on this account that he never characterizes it as the apocalypses invariably do in language suggested by the actual vault of heaven, the sun and the stars. When in the third chapter of Colossians he admonishes Christians to seek the things that are above where Christ is, to set their minds on the things that are above, not on the things that are upon the earth, he says two things about it: that the Christian's life is there already, "for ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God"; and that to seek it, to set one's mind upon it, means to put away earthly passions and unloving tempers and to put on the new man, that is the heart of compassion, kindness, humility, meekness, long-suffering, and above all love. This then is the nature of the other world in Paul's otherworldliness. It is above and

can be seen in vision, but it is within and must be gained by moral effort; and whether above or within its name and nature is Christ. Paul makes no use even of his own apocalyptic vision (2 Cor. 12 1-5) in what he says of the world above. Why should he depend on the visions of others?

It may be worth while to notice a remark by Franz Boll in his *Aus der Offenbarung Johannis* (1914). He finds that where the influence of the Old Testament fails to account for the imagery of the apocalypses, parallels can often be found in the Hellenistic literature of prediction. These analogies are numerous in the Book of Revelation, and at many points illuminating; and there are also many parallels between the Synoptic apocalypses and these texts of Hellenistic astrology; but Boll remarks (p. 135, n. 1) that he does not find in the apocalyptic passages in Paul any allusions to the Hellenistic texts which he has compared.

The dualism of Paul is made fundamentally different from that of the apocalypses by the fact of Christ. The doctrine of the two worlds, this world and the world to come, is often thought to be one of the distinctively apocalyptical conceptions of Paul, but its place in his scheme of thought is very different from that which it occupies in the apocalypse of Ezra. Paul can still speak of this world and of its rulers and even its god. The present world is the place or time of the power of evil. The Christian is not to be conformed to it. But he has already been delivered out of it. He is experiencing its end. Paul scarcely ever speaks of the world to come (see only Eph. 1 21 where its use is rhetorical). In fact the age to come has already dawned for the Christian. Its powers are already experienced, and its glories possessed. Already "all things are yours . . . whether things present or things to come". The dualism which is the key to Paul's thought is not expressed in the words of Ezra, "The Most High has made not one world, but two" (4 Ezra 7 50), but rather in the contrast between flesh and spirit, flesh being essentially Paul's word for human nature apart from the Spirit of God, which is the Spirit of Christ, or simply Christ (Rom. 8 1-11). The word spirit has indeed its eschatological connections; but it is unnecessary to

argue here the evident and recognized fact that one of the greatest achievements of Paul was his thoroughgoing re-interpretation of the conception of spirit into accordance with the actual character of the historical Jesus (I Cor. 12—14). Spirit remains of course to Paul the Divine Power operative in human life. But because he subjects it to the ideals and character, the mind, the love, of Christ, the supernatural becomes spiritual without losing its supernaturalness. Here as everywhere else when Paul thinks of the other world and of its forces and operations he thinks of Christ; and it is the difference which this makes that it is most essential to understand if one would know what has become of the apocalyptic elements of his inheritance in the mind of the Christian Paul. Only to this we must always add that Paul does not look away in order to see Christ, but within. The amazing fact of the Christ-likeness of the Christian is inseparably bound up with the transcendent fact of the God-likeness of Christ. And the Christ-likeness of the Christian is a fact which fills Paul with wonder and humility, but of which he is never for a moment in doubt. It is therefore possible for us, if we would know what Paul means by the other world, and therefore what the essence of his apocalyptic conception is, to look not only with him at Christ, but to look at him, and at Christ in and through him.

There are of course those who strenuously object to the idea that the actual historical fact of Jesus and the reality of his personal qualities and characteristics are the source of Paul's conceptions of religion. It is often argued, as conspicuously by Wrede, that the Christ of Paul's Christianity had nothing to do with the historical Jesus but was a purely mythological figure of Paul's inheritance, the heavenly being who came to earth on man's behalf, died on the cross for man's sin and his redemption, was exalted to the throne of God as Lord, and is soon to come as judge. To this view, as to so many opinions that are expressed about Paul, one feels like answering neither yes nor no. One should rather deny the alternative and reverse the emphasis. It would require space that I cannot here take to give the evidence that convinces

me that Paul knew well, even before his vision, just what manner of man Jesus was; and that the vision was his sudden conviction that this wholly un-messianic teacher, this lowly and crucified one, was the heavenly Messiah of his faith. It was just because in Jesus God had exalted humility and self-sacrificing love to lordship, and revealed them as the secret of the Divine, the foundation and the goal of all things, that Paul experienced so complete a revolution in all his ideals and ideas. The newness of all things was, we may believe, first of all a newness in his ideals and in his character. His letters are full of expressions of his sense that he had already become, though he was still always becoming, like Christ in his moral nature; and about the qualities of that nature he is never uncertain or obscure. They are not in the least different from the qualities which in the Gospels we recognize as those of the historical person Jesus Christ. Paul knows these qualities as one who himself possesses them, or rather is possessed by them, not as one who learns about them from others. Paul himself, whom we know far better than we know his teachings, is the convincing truth that the Jesus whom he knew was the Jesus of history.

The real question, therefore, which we need to ask about the eschatology of Paul is, What results naturally follow and actually followed from these two great facts which are united in his great experience, the fact of Christ and the fact of Paul's own new nature in conformity with Christ?

We notice at once that the very fact that Paul's religion is embodied in his personality distinguishes him from all the writers of apocalypses and puts him rather in the class of the great prophets, whose greatest message was themselves. Paul does not write under the name of some ancient man of God. His letters have more of himself in them than any other biblical writings, even the prophecies of Jeremiah. There is always an element of unreality even in the greatest of the apocalypses. Their assumed authorship involves a separation of the things they write from the actuality of their knowledge and experience. They are students of ancient oracles and are subject to tradition. We feel in them an incapacity to distinguish between outward

forms and inner meanings, between symbols and realities. In all these things Paul is the opposite of an apocalyptic spirit. Paul's experience was his own. The unseen world is therefore not in the same sense mysterious and external as it is when looked at by an outsider. When one has in some real sense seen God for himself his wonder and reverence are not less, but yet the God whom he knows has become in some sense his own inner and true self, and is not a God remote in space, whom one can see only in trance, or distant in time, for whose coming one has to hope and wait.

Much can be said for the value of the apocalypse, for its advance toward a cosmic and universal range and scope, and for its effectiveness in holding men's faith to the unseen reality and future coming of the rule of God in times of stress and strain; nevertheless it remains true that rational soundness and ethical strength are lacking in the apocalypses in comparison with the older prophecy. Paul's account of the newly revealed wisdom of God in I Cor. 1—3 is altogether in the direction of a return to inwardness and reality. Spiritual things are spiritually judged, and must therefore be known by every man for himself, quite in accordance with Jeremiah's ideal (31 31-34). The man who thus sees and judges is free and needs no outward authority. In this description of the nature of the new knowledge the nature of the things known is given. They consist of such things as can be known only in this way; and Paul is surely unmistakable in his indications as to what these things are. They are things that create humility over against all pride of opinion, and they are things that issue in the unity of mutual love, in contrast to everything that produces jealousy and strife. The height and depth of knowledge which Paul prays that Christians may apprehend is nothing but that love of Christ which passeth knowledge. Moral motives and values are dominant in the eschatology of Paul.

The coming of the Lord was always the center of the Old Testament and Jewish hope for the future. For early Christianity and for Paul the coming of the Lord was the coming of Christ. Paul takes this expectation for granted as a primary and unquestionable part of the new religion; but its place in

his religion is different from its place in Matthew or in Revelation. Paul knows three comings of Christ. The first is the historical coming; and Paul sees more clearly than popular Jewish Christianity did that this has and keeps the place of first importance. It is by the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ that redemption has been wrought out and accomplished. The cross is to Paul the dividing point between the old and the new. When Christ was raised by God from death and became life-giving spirit and was given the supreme title of Lord, a new creation was brought into being which can be compared only to God's calling of light out of darkness in the beginning, or to his making the first man a living soul. The gospel thus revealed and imparted is the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. The spiritual nature of the second man, the heavenly, is the beginning and source of a new and in the end all-inclusive humanity. This means that the coming of God, which was the hope of Paul's favorite Old Testament books, Isaiah and the Psalms, is in the most real sense a historical fact of the immediate past. With the resurrection of Christ the age to come has already begun. There is surely reason enough in this alone to account for the fact that Paul has little interest in the apocalypses, which have to do only with the future manifestation of a God who is now hidden or withdrawn. The difference involved in this conception of Paul is much more than a difference in time between a future and a past event. It involves a fundamental difference in kind. Externality and sensible images must essentially give place to inner experience in the thought of one to whom the fundamental intervening of God in human history took place in Christ and in his death and exaltation.

To understand the way in which Paul conceives this coming we must turn to what follows directly from it, to Paul's addition of a second coming of the Lord to his past historical coming, namely his present coming as spirit. The present experience of Christ as indwelling, and as the Divine Power that re-creates human nature, is the most characteristic and original element in his Christian thinking. The phrase "in Christ" seems to

have been his own creation, and expresses his sense that Christ has become in some most real though mysterious sense the Divine element in which he lives, his own new nature, truly himself, though also not himself, the reality of the immanent God, whose presence means now the power of righteousness, and hereafter the power of eternal life. J. Weiss (*Das Urchristentum*, p. 408) says, "If the mystic experience is the anticipation of future blessedness as present, then mysticism is in a certain way the annulling or overcoming of eschatology. In the degree in which the eschatological hope still rules in the religion of Paul, in that degree his religion is not mystical. This however is the case in so high a degree that the range of mysticism in him is thereby very considerably limited". My own inclination would be to put emphasis on the contrary inference, and say that the importance of eschatology in the religion of Paul must be very considerably limited by the vivid reality with which Paul conceives his own life and that of every Christian to be already a life of oneness with Christ. The word spirit was of indispensable value to Paul in his effort to express this part of his Christian experience and to keep in relation with one another factors in it which were difficult to hold together. The spirit is both supernatural and inward; it expresses our experience of the Divine as both above us and within. Of course the present experience of Christ as Divine Spirit did not exclude from Paul's view the expectation of his personal coming and the desire for a personal 'being with the Lord'. On the other hand, Paul speaks of the spirit as the ground of our hope (Rom. 5 5), as the pledge, the first fruits, the promise, the seal, of that which is still to come (Gal. 3 14; Rom. 8 23; II Cor. 1 22 5 5; Eph. 1 13, 14 4 30). The resurrection of Christ, which as we have seen was to Paul the first properly eschatological event, is thought of by him as something already experienced in the case of every Christian. "Ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God". "If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above". And this being raised together with Christ means that the Christian walks in newness of life.[4] In this language of Paul concerning the dying

[4] See Rom. 6 1-11.

and rising of men with Christ there is the most striking evidence of the ease and naturalness with which the eschatological is converted in his mind into present inward and ethical experiences. One feels that this characteristic is due less to a natural mysticism in Paul than to the strength and consistency with which he carried through his picture of the actual character of the actual Jesus, and subjected all things to the test of that character. It is because it was Jesus who died and rose that his dying and rising become not only facts of the past, and not only among past facts the greatest in human history, but also inner experiences, the death of fleshly passions and of all selfishness and every divisive feeling and the beginning of a new and until then impossible kind of life.

In this quality of Paul's Christian thinking we see a further reason why apocalypses would lose their appeal to him. The spirit of the greatest of the apocalypses is a spirit of exclusiveness and of fear and hatred toward the world. They express the self-assertion of the Jewish, or as in the Book of Revelation of the Christian, church, over against a dominant world power that threatens its destruction. Their strength is in their appeal to the martyr spirit of fidelity amid persecution, in view of the certain intervention of God for the destruction of the wicked and the elevation of the faithful to power and blessedness. But to Paul the love of God, as evident and effective in Christ, puts an end to distinction, and works in and through men toward the creation of oneness and peace. The hope of the writer of Daniel is for the destruction of Antiochus Epiphanes and of the Greek empire, and the rule in its place of the people of the saints of the Most High. The hope of John, the prophet, was for the fall of the Roman empire; and for this the writers of the apocalypses of Ezra and Baruch looked forward, as did the earlier Psalms of Solomon, and the Assumption of Moses. Paul also has his eye on the Roman empire, but his apostolic calling, and his passionate desire and confident expectation, are not its destruction, but its conversion; and this difference is due to Jesus, that is to the fact that the Messiah is now known to be a man long-

suffering and forgiving toward sinners, drawing and uniting all men through the power of his humility and love.

What now is distinctive in Paul's view of the still future coming of that Christ whose first coming brought redemption and created a new world, and whose present inward coming is the power of new life in men, transforming them progressively into its own likeness? The parousia, or manifestation, or coming of the Lord is appealed to by Paul frequently as a motive to Christian living, and is desired by him as meaning a closer fellowship of the disciple with his master. We should expect to find that Paul's hope for the coming of Christ is consistent with his understanding of the significance of his death and resurrection as the turning point in history, and with his conviction that Christ already lives in him. And in reality the future coming does seem in Paul's thought to bring only fullness and completion to that which has been already given and is already possessed. Christ is to Paul always a person toward whom his love is intense and his loyalty and devotion unbounded. But he is at the same time a divine principle and a human ideal. Because this principle and ideal is Love, only a person can be its expression or embodiment, a person who loves and is loved. It is not only the distinctive characteristic of the Christian religion that it is embodied in an actual person, but its nature is such that it could not be contained in any other vessel than that of personality; or, we may say, Christ was such a person that the religious movement started by him must because of its nature continue to be bound up with him. To one who, like Paul, thus conceives of religion, the coming of Christ could no longer mean the coming of a certain nation to political dominance, nor the coming of Enoch's Son of Man as the divine agent for judgment. It could mean essentially nothing but the completion of the coming of the Divine Love, and that in its only conceivable embodiment in personalities.

In two passages Paul discusses the coming of the Lord in some detail. 1 Thes. 4 13—5 11 aims to allay the fear that Christians who die before Christ's coming would have no part in it. Paul's answer is that the dead and living will fare alike, and that 'being ever with the Lord' is equally the goal for all.

In I Cor. 15 the objection of the Greek mind to the idea of resurrection is discussed at length and a middle path is sought between the Jewish conception of resurrection and the Greek conception of the immortality of the soul, its separation from the body being its escape from a prison or tomb. Paul's thought is determined here of course in part by his Hebrew heritage but also and fundamentally by that which forms the ground and the contents of his hope, the destined oneness of the Christian with Christ. Death will not separate us from him, but rather his coming will mean our translation, out of death, or, if we live, out of our flesh and blood nature, into the spiritual nature of Christ. We shall bear his image as we have borne the image of Adam. Personal fellowship with Christ, and to this end likeness in nature to Christ, constitute the real meaning of the coming of the Lord to Paul. It is impossible to read his letters and still suppose that the physical descent of Christ, the shouting and sound of the trumpet of God, the bodily rapture of Christians into the spaces between earth and heaven, are original with Paul or of any essential importance to him. To be forever with the Lord is his hope, and he will not tolerate any conceptions which seem to him to put in danger the certainty and full reality of this personal life with Christ. Death before his coming must not stand in its way; and the nature of life after death cannot be different from *his* life after death. To Paul the Greek immortality of the soul did not seem fully personal nor fitted to introduce the man himself into the presence of the heavenly Lord. Unless we also rise, and rise just as he did, to the same sort of heavenly existence, how can we hope for that association with him which is our heart's desire? "None of us liveth to himself, and none dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's." "Our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we wait for a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ; who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, according to the working whereby he is able even to subject all things unto himself." In such sentences we have both the contents

and the spirit of Paul's eschatology. To be with Christ and to be wholly one with him is then the thing essential and all-inclusive.[5]

If we look for further details which do not suggest the mere acceptance of current tradition but seem to be matters of Paul's own interest and reflection, we note especially the following. In the first place Paul looks forward to the redemption of the body as that which is still future, for those whom the spirit of life in Christ Jesus has already freed from the law of sin and of death, and who are even "not in the flesh, but in the spirit", because the spirit of God, that is the spirit of Christ, or Christ himself, dwells in them. We "who have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for our adoption, the redemption of our body". This is that "revealing of the sons of God" for which the whole creation waits, since it will bring to creation itself deliverance from the bondage of corruption. This magnificent picture of a transformation of the physical world into its destined fitness for spiritual life (Rom. 8 18-25) is surely the creation of Paul's own genius. It implies in striking form his conviction that the greater redemption, that of the human mind from the dominion of sin, is a thing of past fact and present experience. The inward is essentially achieved; the outward remains for the future.

Another striking prophetic outlook of Paul concerns the completion of his own task as apostle to the Gentiles, the subjection of humanity in its completeness to Christ, and the inclusion in the end of his own brethren to whom sonship and the promises originally belonged (Rom. 9—11).

In I Cor. 15 20-28, we have an apocalyptic picture which depends in part on tradition but is shaped by Paul's mind, and reaches at the end a high and difficult point on which we could have wished that he had cast further light. Paul everywhere understands that Divine Love, which is the mind of Christ, is the creator of unity. He assails more vehemently

[5] The writer has discussed more fully Paul's conception of life after death in a chapter of *Religion and the Future Life*, edited by E. H. Sneath, The Revell Co. 1922.

than any other fault in his Christian churches every tendency toward strife, ill will, envy, rivalry, and self-assertion. Christianity means the end of all those distinctions which religion itself had magnified in the past. "There is no distinction" (Rom. 3 22). "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye all are one man in Christ Jesus" (Gal. 3 28). "Where there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman: but Christ is all, and in all." This last passage (Col. 3 11) belongs in the description of what Paul would have Christians see and become when they set their minds on the things that are above. When Paul looks forward to Christ's completion of his conquest of evil he sees a fulfillment of that supreme forecast of prophecy "The Lord shall be King over all the earth: in that day shall the Lord be one and his name one" (Zech. 14 9). The oneness which is the goal of Paul's hope is not only created by the Divine Love, but is certainly in its nature the oneness of love. When therefore Paul says, "when all things have been subjected unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all", he cannot mean a return of the movements of history and nature into the God from whom they went forth of such a nature that an abstract and empty unity alone is left. God is the fulness of life and his oneness can be only inclusive of all that love is and effects. At this high point of Paul's passion and thought we are certainly to see nothing inconsistent with, or different from, that other height, perhaps the greatest that he attained, where he exclaims, "I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8 38 f.).

The eschatology of Paul is of such a nature, so vital, so alive with the force of his personality, so "carried alive into the heart by passion", that it is impossible to approach toward an understanding of it except by the use of his own words. Paul was of course a man of his time, and we can learn from

him much in regard to the thoughts of his time as to heavenly things and beings, and future divine events. We need also the light of all contemporary literature, including the apocalyptic, in order to understand his language and the forms of his thought. But Paul was a great personality and had a great experience; and the new feelings and thoughts which this experience called forth in him are more significant than the forms in which they struggled for expression. It is possible that a development can be traced in his letters from more outward to more spiritual forms of hope; but the underlying principles of his religion of hope remain the same, and what is more certain and more important than a development of his ideas is the fact that always and everywhere the bearing and natural tendency and effect of his thought and feeling are toward the spiritual. The Christian both is and is to be like Christ. And that which we hope for we already possess, and so know, even though only in part, yet with the certainty of actual experience. But this Christ-likeness now and hereafter is both a gift from God, a divine creation, and also equally a moral ideal and achievement. Paul charges his disciples to become that which in reality they are, to walk by the spirit by which they live, and urges them to strive for the goal to which they are destined; speaking of himself also, even at the end of his life, as still seeking to lay hold of that for which also he was laid hold of by Christ Jesus (Phil. 3 8–14). There is scarcely any analogy in the literature of apocalyptic to the way in which Paul undertakes as man's own purpose and responsibility all that for which he also hopes from the purpose and manifest coming and act of God.

DATE DUE

BS 680 .E8 S63 1923

Society of Biblical Literature.

A symposium on eschatology

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BS680.E8 S61923
Society of Bi A symposium on eschatology
3 0645 0005 8764 8